



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 07029861 1

THE
CHURCHMAN ARMED

AGAINST THE
ERRORS OF THE TIME.

BY "THE SOCIETY FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF
TRACTS IN DEFENCE OF THE UNITED CHURCH
OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND, AS BY LAW ESTAB-
LISHED."

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

Printed for J. J. STOCKDALE, No. 41, Pall-Mall, and F. C. and
J. RIVINGTON, St. Paul's Church Yard.

1814.

Churchman
Z P M

Printed by Cox and Baylis,
Great Queen Street, Lincoln's-Inn-Fields.

To be continued Monthly, price One Shilling each Number.

This Day are published, No. I. to XXIV. (being the First and Second Volumes) of

THE PROTESTANT ADVOCATE,

OR A

REVIEW OF PUBLICATIONS

RELATING TO THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION,

AND

REPERTORY

OF

PROTESTANT INTELLIGENCE.

London: Printed for J. J. Stockdale, No. 41, Pall-Mall, Bookseller to the Society for the Distribution of Tracts in Defence of the United Church of England and Ireland, as by Law established.



THIS miscellany having now been carried on Two Years, the public may fairly judge how it has fulfilled the objects of its establishment. It contains many curious and important Popish documents, and enjoys the correspondence and active support of some of the highest and most estimable characters in the United Kingdom.

PROSPECTUS.

At a time when the Roman Catholic Body are making the most strenuous and daring efforts to impress on the Public the NECESSITY of submitting to their claims, and even confidently assert a general willingness that they should be granted, it will appear only a measure of self-defence that there should be a PROTESTANT ADVOCATE, to defend our Establishments in Church and State, and to maintain the general cause of civil and religious liberty against the intolerant principles of the Roman Catholics, and their unceasing attempts to obtain possession of political power.

The objects which the PROTESTANT ADVOCATE has more immediately in view, are, to unite the exertions of Protestants of all descriptions, in defence of the liberty, civil and religious, which is now enjoyed by the

subject of these realms; to convey such general information as may lay open the designs of the Roman Catholics; to expose the mistatements, religious and political, of the advocates of their cause; to open the eyes of the Public to the tenets really professed by the Irish Roman Catholic Church: to shew that it is not a slight, but a great and essential difference which exists between Popery and Protestantism, and that the leading doctrines of the former religion are the same now as they were at the period of the blessed Reformation; to scrutinize the pretensions of the Roman Catholics, and to prove the utter hopelessness of conciliating their affections by any thing short of a surrender of the Constitution; to point out the unfairness with which their claims are brought forward, to display their real extent and their unavoidable consequences, and to shew what the effect on the Constitution generally would be, and what especially on our invaluable privileges, as Protestants, and on the cause of religion, if those persons whose exclusion from power was, at the time of the Revolution, made a permanent principle of the Constitution, were again admitted to power in this Kingdom.

The object of this publication is one common to all Protestants; it is to guard the sacred cause of religious liberty; it is to defend our Protestant Brethren, IN IRELAND, ESPECIALLY, against Roman Catholic ascendancy and eventual persecution—against the domination of a sect which history has shewn to be invariably hostile to all religious freedom; it is to preserve, for the sake of peace and security, that Established Church, whose principle and practice it is to leave every man at liberty to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; it is, in a word, to secure and perpetuate that truly tolerant Establishment, under which, by God's blessing, this country has so eminently flourished, and to transmit it, unimpaired, to our children, and to our children's children.

By pursuing such a course, the Conductors of the PROTESTANT ADVOCATE trust they shall open the eyes of the Public to the vital importance of the subject; and that, whether in PARLIAMENT or in ELECTIONS, whether in social intercourse or in publications, they shall contribute to excite a proper feeling for the maintenance of that Constitution, which has long been, and which will, we hope, long be the admiration and the safeguard of the political, moral, and religious world. It will be their endeavour to point out in every view and in every instance, the DUTY and real INTEREST of PROTESTANTS: it will also be their earnest wish to draw the Roman Catholics to a sense of THEIR duty and real interest,—the duty they owe to their King rather than to the Pope, to their Country rather than to Rome,—and to remind them of the many acts of indulgence granted them during the present reign. The Conductors of this work pledge themselves never to depart from the principles upon which it is undertaken. Their minds are indelibly impressed with the truth, that it is not by yielding principles, and surrendering institutions, to the difficulty of times, but only by maintaining them against all opposition and clinging to them steadily, even through the severest persecution, that we can hope to pass through the storm of infidelity and anarchy which is gathering around us, unperceived, while *our eyes are dazzled by the glare of a SPURIOUS LIBERALITY.*

The conduct of the PROTESTANT ADVOCATE is in the hands of Members of the Established Church: but information and assistance will be most thankfully received from all persons who are friendly to the undertaking.

THE
CHURCHMAN ARMED
AGAINST
THE ERRORS OF THE TIME.

PART III.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

AFTER having directed our thoughts to the nature of ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENTS in general, and of those TESTS by which they are guarded, our attention is called in regular order to the consideration of that portion of the Christian church, which is established in this and in our sister kingdom.

The *Church of England* has no ordinary claims upon the affections of every native Englishman, not less from the nationality of its origin, and the antiquity of its existence, than from its intimate and indissoluble connection, in all its ramifications, with that constitution, which is the wonder of each surrounding nation, and the pride and glory of his own. But these are considerations which weigh but as dust in the balance, upon the mind of a Christian, when

placed in comparison with those higher and more exalted principles, upon which the Church of England rests her claims to our veneration and regard. It is not as she is an integral part of our political constitution, that we strengthen her fabric, and support her power, but as she is the faithful representative of Christ upon earth, as she is a pure and spotless portion of that universal church, which, though now militant here on earth, shall hereafter reign triumphant in Heaven. It is upon these grounds alone that, as Christians, we submit to the authority, obey the ordinances, and recognize the pre-eminence of this our English church.

Of all ecclesiastical establishments, and of all the various forms of Christian government, known under the name of national churches, we may without fear assert that the Church of England is among the purest, the holiest, and most perfect. And this we believe, not from any inherent claims in herself to a higher share of Christian perfection, nor in detriment to the excellence of established churches in any other nation, but from her strict conformity with the commands of her great Master, and her close resemblance, both in constitution and in form, to the primitive and apostolical churches. Though "her foundations are upon the holy hills," she vindicates to herself no share of innate authority, or necessary infallibility. All the power which is assumed by her, over the wills and the affections of her children, is derived from a higher source. Every article in the faith, every

law in the constitution, every ordinance in the discipline of the Church of England, is binding only upon the consciences of her sons as it is immediately derived from the authority of Scripture. Scripture is the test by which the validity of her claims are to be tried, and is the only criterion by which she can be judged. But here a material point arises ; it is not upon Scripture, as interpreted by herself, that she relies, but upon Scripture as interpreted by the laws of sound reason and of common sense. There are parts of the Church of Christ which rest their claims nominally upon Scripture, but then it is upon Scripture interpreted by themselves. They acknowledge, indeed, the existence of the law by which they are to be judged, as did the Scribes and Pharisees of old, but at the same time they reserve to themselves the sole and paramount authority of their own interpretation ; thus reasoning, if reason it can be called, as it were in a circle, first taking for granted their authority in the interpretation of Scripture, and then proving it from itself. The Church of England, on the contrary, when she submits herself to this test, resigns every inherent claim of interpretation, and calls in sound and unprejudiced reason as the judge, either to confirm or to reject her claims. Whatever cannot be drawn by the deduction of clear and unsophisticated argumentation, from the pure fountain of the Holy Scriptures, forms no article, either of her constitution or of her creed. “ Holy Scripture containeth
“ all things necessary to salvation : so that, what-

“ soever is not read therein, nor may be proved
“ thereby, is not to be required of any man, that
“ it should be believed as an article of the faith,
“ or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.”

Article vi.

At the same time, in all things not repugnant to Scripture, we acknowledge her rights as a “ particular or national church,” to ordain those rites and ceremonies, so necessary to the decent performance of Christian worship, and to establish that discipline, which is so essential to the existence of any ecclesiastical polity here upon earth. And surely, in the view of enemies no less than friends, never was a ceremonial more simple and affecting, a liturgy more solemn and sublime, a constitution more scriptural, or more consonant to the “ perfect law of liberty,” than those which the CHURCH OF ENGLAND has established and ordained.

These are the high grounds upon which our affection, and regard to our national church, which we bear to her as Christians, rest. As lovers of that order and uniformity, which is so essential to the preservation of every constitution, no less ecclesiastical than civil, we acknowledge the necessity of an established church ; as persuaded that, upon the authority of Scripture as by the most reasonable deductions it may be proved, the Church of England rests her claims, we become the faithful children of her institution, and the zealous supporters of her holy fabric.

After these more exalted motives of attachment

and regard, it might appear unnecessary to descend to any lower or less important considerations. We might otherwise be induced to point out, in conformity with that Christian moderation which characterizes all its ecclesiastical proceedings, its peculiar agreement with the form and the spirit of our civil constitution. Never were Church and State in any country more closely connected, not merely by external provisions and laws, but by the similarity of their views and the resemblance of their polity. The Church of England is most congenial to the temper, to the manners, and to the opinions of the English nation, considered as a political body. It is a church which, though a warm supporter of a monarchical government, never can become the creature and the minister of arbitrary power. Much less will it encourage, on the other hand, the levelling principle of democratic virulence, or the still more intolerable tyranny of the low, the ignorant, and the infatuated. Popery and arbitrary power mutually strengthen and support each other, while the extremes of atheism and fanaticism are the surest abettors of popular violence. The Church of England is peculiarly adapted, both by its discipline and its temper, to that limited power, and that chastened freedom, which are the pride and glory of our civil constitution.

Under these impressions, we offer to our readers upon this important head a celebrated tract of Archbishop Synge, entitled "A True Churchman set in
" a just and true Light," which, though occasionally

quaint and obsolete in its mode of expression, is nevertheless a store of sound sense and Christian principle. A tract also of Bishop Ellys, shewing that supremacy in matters ecclesiastical are vested in the Crown, will illustrate a leading feature in the constitution of our natural Church. On the "Sentiments of a Church of England Man," by Dean Swift, we can only observe, that for a calm and practical view of the temper and moderation of the Church of England, both in its ecclesiastical and political bearings, a more able, clear, and persuasive statement does not exist. It is, indeed, worthy of the deep discernment, and the plain but powerful sense of its great author. Of living authors we can say but little, their works must speak for themselves; in silence therefore we present to our readers, as the concluding article in this department, the Sermon of Dr. Rennell, Dean of Winchester, before the Sons of the Clergy, as an apology not only for the Church of England, but for the lives, the characters and the fame of those ministers, who by the strength of their ability, and the splendour of their attainments, have left their names its brightest ornaments, and their writings its ablest defenders to each succeeding age. We trust, that in recalling the attention of the public to the Sermon, we shall not have disgraced our privilege of selection, or forfeited the attention and confidence of our readers.

THE SENTIMENTS OF A CHURCH OF
ENGLAND MAN WITH RESPECT TO
RELIGION AND GOVERNMENT.

BY DEAN SWIFT.

WHOEVER has examined the conduct and proceedings of both parties, for some years past, whether, in or out of power, cannot well conceive it possible to go far toward the extremes of either, without offering some violence to his integrity, or understanding. A wise and a good man may indeed be sometimes induced to comply with a number, whose opinion he generally approves, though it be perhaps against his own. But this liberty should be made use of upon very few occasions, and those of small importance, and then only with a view of bringing over his own side, another time, to something of greater and more publick moment. But to sacrifice the innocence of a friend, the good of our country, or our own conscience, to the humour, or passion, or interest of a party, plainly shows, that either our heads or our hearts are not as they should be: yet this very practice is the fundamental law of each faction among us, as may be obvious to any, who will

impartially, and without engagement, be at the pains to examine their actions, which however is not so easy a task : for it seems a principle in human nature, to incline one way more than another, even in matters where we are wholly unconcerned. And it is a common observation, that, in reading a history of facts done a thousand years ago, or standing by at play among those, who are perfect strangers to us, we are apt to find our hopes and wishes engaged, on a sudden, in favour of one side more than another. No wonder then that we are all so ready to interest ourselves in the course of publick affairs, where the most inconsiderable have some real share, and, by the wonderful importance which every man is of to himself, a very great imaginary one.

And indeed, when the two parties, that divide the whole commonwealth, come once to a rupture, without any hopes left of forming a third, with better principles, to balance the others, it seems every man's duty to choose one of the two sides, though he cannot entirely approve of either ; and all pretences to neutrality are justly exploded by both, being too stale and obvious, only intending the safety and ease of a few individuals, while the publick is embroiled. This was the opinion and practice of the latter Cato,* whom I esteem to have been the wisest and best of all the Romans.

* One of the sextumvirate in Gulliver, part iii. chap. vii.

But, before things proceed to open violence, the truest service a private man may hope to do his country, is, by unbiassing his mind as much as possible, and then endeavouring to moderate between the rival powers; which must needs be owned a fair proceeding with the world, because it is, of all others, the least consistent with the common design of making a fortune, by the merits of an opinion.

I have gone as far as I am able in qualifying myself to be such a moderator: I believe I am no bigot in religion, and I am sure I am none in government. I converse in full freedom with many considerable men of both parties; and if not in equal number, it is purely accidental and personal, as happening to be near the Court, and to have made acquaintance there, more under one ministry than another. Then, I am not under the necessity of declaring myself by the prospect of an employment. And lastly, if all this be not sufficient, I industriously conceal my name, which wholly exempts me from any hopes and fears in delivering my opinion.

In consequence of this free use of my reason, I cannot possibly think so well or so ill of either party, as they would endeavour to persuade the world of each other, and of themselves. For instance; I do not charge it upon the body of the whigs or the tories, that their several principles lead them to introduce presbytery, and the religion of the church of Rome; or a commonwealth,

and arbitrary power. For why should any party be accused of a principle, which they solemnly disown and protest against? But, to this, they have a mutual answer ready: they both assure us, that their adversaries are not to be believed; that they disown their principles out of fear, which are manifest enough, when we examine their practices. To prove this, they will produce instances, on one side, either of avowed presbyterians, or persons of libertine and atheistical tenets; and, on the other, of professed papists, or such as are openly in the interest of the abdicated family. Now, it is very natural for all subordinate sects and denominations in a state, to side with some general party, and to choose that, which they find to agree with themselves in some general principle. Thus, at the restoration, the presbyterians, anabaptists, independents, and other sects, did all, with very good reason, unite and solder up their several schemes, to join against the church; who, without regard to their distinctions, treated them all as equal adversaries. Thus, our present dissenters do very naturally close in with the whigs, who profess moderation, declare they abhor all thoughts of persecution, and think it hard that those, who differ only in a few ceremonies, and speculations, should be denied the privilege and profit of serving their country, in the highest employments of state. Thus, the atheist, libertines, despisers of religion and revelation in general, that is to say, all those who usually pass under the name of freethinkers, do properly join

with the same body ; because they likewise preach up moderation, and are not so overnice to distinguish between an unlimited liberty of conscience, and an unlimited freedom of opinion. Then, on the other side, the professed firmness of the tories for episcopacy, as an apostolical institution ; their aversion to those sects, who lie under the reproach of having once destroyed their constitution, and who, they imagine, by too indiscreet a zeal for reformation, have defaced the primitive model of the church ; next their veneration for monarchical government in the common course of succession, and their hatred to republican schemes : these, I say, are principles which not only the nonjuring zealots profess, but even papists themselves fall readily in with. And every extreme here mentioned, flings a general scandal upon the whole body it pretends to adhere to.

But surely no man whatsoever, ought, in justice or good manners, to be charged with principles he actually disowns, unless his practices do openly, and without the least room for doubt, contradict his profession ; not upon small surmises, or because he has the misfortune to have ill men sometimes agree with him in a few general sentiments. However, though the extremes of whig and tory seem, with little justice, to have drawn religion into their controversies, wherein they have small concern, yet they both have borrowed one leading principle from the abuse of it ; which is, to have built their several systems of political faith, not upon inquiries

after truth, but upon opposition to each other, upon injurious appellations, charging their adversaries with horrid opinions, and then reproaching them for the want of charity; *et neuter falso*.

In order to remove these prejudices, I have thought nothing could be more effectual, than to describe the sentiments of a Church of England man, with respect to religion and government. This I shall endeavour to do in such a manner, as may not be liable to the least objection from either party, and which I am confident would be assented to by great numbers in both, if they were not misled to those mutual misrepresentations, by such motives, as they would be ashamed to own.

I shall begin with religion.

And here, though it makes an odd sound, yet it is necessary to say, that whoever professes himself a member of the Church of England, ought to believe a God, and his providence, together with revealed religion, and the divinity of Christ. For beside those many thousands, who (to speak in the phrase of divines) do practically deny all this by the immorality of their lives, there is no small number, who, in their conversation and writings, directly, or by consequence, endeavour to overthrow it; yet all these place themselves in the list of the national church, though at the same time (as it is highly reasonable) they are great sticklers for liberty of conscience.

To enter upon particulars: a Church of England

man has a true veneration for the scheme established among us of ecclesiastick government; and though he will not determine whether episcopacy be of divine right, he is sure it is most agreeable to primitive institution, fittest of all others for preserving order and purity, and under its present regulations best calculated for our civil state: he should therefore think the abolishment of that order among us, would prove a mighty scandal and corruption to our faith, and manifestly dangerous to our monarchy: nay, he would defend it by arms against all the powers on earth except our legislature, in which case he would submit as to a general calamity, a dearth or a pestilence.

As to rites and ceremonies, and forms of prayer, he allows there might be some useful alterations, and more, which in the prospect of uniting christians might be very supportable, as things declared in their own nature indifferent; to which he therefore would readily comply, if the clergy, or (though this be not so fair a method) if the legislature should direct: yet, at the same time, he cannot altogether blame the former, for their unwillingness to consent to any alteration; which, beside the trouble, and perhaps disgrace, would certainly never produce the good effects intended by it. The only condition that could make it prudent and just for the clergy to comply in altering the ceremonial, or any other indifferent part, would be a firm resolution in the legislature to interpose, by some strict and effectual laws, to prevent the rising and

spreading of new sects, how plausible soever, for the future; else there must never be an end: and it would be to act like a man, who should pull down and change the ornaments of his house, in compliance to every one who was disposed to find fault as he passed by; which, beside the perpetual trouble and expense, would very much damage, and perhaps in time destroy the building. Sects in a state, seem only tolerated with any reason, because they are already spread; and because it would not be agreeable with so mild a government, or so pure a religion as ours, to use violent methods against great numbers of mistaken people, while they do not manifestly endanger the constitution of either. But the greatest advocates for general liberty of conscience will allow, that they ought to be checked in their beginnings, if they will allow them to be an evil at all; or, which is the same thing, if they will only grant it were better for the peace of the state, that there should be none. But while the clergy consider the natural temper of mankind in general, or of our own country in particular, what assurances can they have that any compliances they shall make, will remove the evil of dissension, while the liberty still continues of professing whatever new opinion we please? Or how can it be imagined, that the body of dissenting teachers, who must be all undone by such a revolution, will not cast about for some new objections to withhold their flocks, and draw in

fresh proselytes, by some farther innovations or refinements?

Upon these reasons, he is for tolerating such different forms in religious worship as are already admitted, but by no means for leaving it in the power of those who are tolerated, to advance their own models, upon the ruin of what is already established; which it is natural for all sects to desire, and which they cannot be justified by any consistent principles if they do not endeavour; and yet, which they cannot succeed in, without the utmost danger to the public peace.

To prevent these inconveniences, he thinks it highly just, that all rewards of trust, profit, or dignity, which the state leaves in the disposal of the administration, should be given only to those whose principles direct them to preserve the constitution in all its parts. In the late affair of occasional conformity, the general argument of those who were against it, was, not to deny it an evil in itself, but that the remedy proposed was violent, untimely and improper; which is the bishop of Salisbury's * opinion in the speech he made and published against the bill: but however just their fears or complaints might have been upon that score, he thinks it a little too gross and precipitate to employ their writers already in arguments for repealing the sacramental test, upon no wiser maxim, than that no man should, on the account of con-

* Dr. Gilbert Burnet.

science, be deprived the liberty of serving his country; a topic which may be equally applied to admit papists, atheists, mahometans, heathens, and jews. If the church wants members of its own to employ in the service of the public, or be so unhappily contrived, as to exclude from its communion such persons who are likeliest to have great abilities, it is time it should be altered, and reduced into some more perfect, or at least more popular form; but, in the mean while, it is not altogether improbable, that when those, who dislike the constitution, are so very zealous in their offers for the service of their country, they are not wholly unmindful of their party, or of themselves.

The Dutch, whose practice is so often quoted to prove and celebrate the great advantages of a general liberty of conscience, have yet a national religion professed by all who bear office among them: but why should they be a precedent for us either in religion or government? our country differs from theirs, as well in situation, soil, and productions of nature, as in the genius and complexion of inhabitants. They are a commonwealth founded on a sudden, by a desperate attempt in a desperate condition, not formed or digested into a regular system by mature thought and reason, but huddled up under the pressure of sudden exigencies; calculated for no long duration, and hitherto subsisting by accident, in the midst of contending powers, who cannot yet agree about sharing it among them. These difficulties do indeed preserve them from any

great corruptions, which their crazy constitution would extremely subject them to in a long peace. That confluence of people, in a persecuting age, to a place of refuge nearest at hand, put them upon the necessity of trade, to which they wisely gave all ease and encouragement: and if we could think fit to imitate them in this last particular, there would need no more to invite foreigners among us; who seem to think no farther than how to secure their property and conscience, without projecting any share in that government which gives them protection, or calling it persecution, if it be denied them. But, I speak it for the honour of our administration, although our sects are not so numerous as those in Holland, which I presume is not our fault, and I hope is not our misfortune, we must excel them, and all Christendom besides, in our indulgence to tender consciences.* One single compliance with the national form of receiving the sacrament, is all we require to qualify any sectary among us for the greatest employments in the state, after which he is at liberty to rejoin his own assemblies for the rest of his life. Besides, I will suppose any of the numerous sects in Holland to have so far prevailed, as to have raised a civil war, destroyed their government and religion, and put their administrators to death; after which, I will suppose the people to have recovered all again, and to have settled on their old foundation. Then I would put a query,

* When this was written, there was no law against occasional conformity.

whether that sect, which was the unhappy instrument of all this confusion, could reasonably expect to be intrusted for the future with the greatest employments, or indeed to be hardly tolerated among them ?

To go on with the sentiments of a Church of England man : he does not see how that mighty passion for the church, which some men pretend, can well consist with those indignities and that contempt they bestow on the persons of the clergy. It is a strange mark whereby to distinguish high churchmen, that they are such, who imagine the clergy can never be too low. He thinks the maxim these gentlemen are so fond of, that they are for an humble clergy, is a very good one : and so is he, and for an humble laity too, since humility is a virtue that perhaps equally befits and adorns every station of life,

But then, if the scribblers on the other side freely speak the sentiments of their party, a divine of the church of England cannot look for much better quarter thence. You shall observe nothing more frequent in their weekly papers, than a way of affecting to confound the terms of clergy and high church, of applying both indifferently, and then loading the latter with all the calumny they can invent. They will tell you, they honour a clergyman ; but talk at the same time, as if there were not three in the kingdom, who could fall in with their definition. After the like manner they insult the universities, as poisoned fountains and corrupters of youth.

Now it seems clear to me, that the whigs might

easily have procured, and maintained a majority among the clergy, and perhaps in the universities, if they had not too much encouraged, or connived at, this intemperance of speech and virulence of pen, in the worst and most prostitute of their party; among whom there has been, for some years past, such a perpetual clamour against the ambition, the implacable temper, and the covetousness of the priesthood; such a cant of high church and persecution, and being priestridden; so many reproaches about narrow principles, or terms of communion; then such scandalous reflections on the universities, for infecting the youth of the nation with arbitrary and jacobite principles, that it was natural for those who had the care of religion and education, to apprehend some general design of altering the constitution of both. And all this was the more extraordinary, because it could not easily be forgot, that whatever opposition was made to the usurpations of King James, proceeded altogether from the church of England, and chiefly from the clergy and one of the universities. For, if it were of any use to recal matters of fact, what is more notorious than that prince's applying himself first to the church of England? and, upon their refusal to fall in with his measures, making the like advances to the dissenters of all kinds, who readily and almost universally complied with him, affecting, in their numerous addresses and pamphlets, the style of our brethren the Roman catholics; whose interests they put on the same foot with their own: and some of Cromwell's

officers took posts in the army raised against the Prince of Orange. These proceedings of theirs, they can only extenuate by urging the provocations they had met from the church in King Charles's reign ; which, though perhaps excusable upon the score of human infirmity, are not, by any means, a plea of merit, equal to the constancy and sufferings of the bishops and clergy, or of the head and fellows of Magdalen college, that furnished the Prince of Orange's declaration with such powerful arguments, to justify and promote the revolution.

Therefore, a Church of England man abhors the humour of the age, in delighting to fling scandals upon the clergy in general ; which, beside the disgrace to the reformation, and to religion itself, cast an ignominy upon the kingdom that it does not deserve. We have no better materials to compound the priesthood of, than the mass of mankind, which corrupted as it is, those who receive orders must have some vices to leave behind them when they enter into the church ; and if a few do still adhere, it is no wonder, but rather a great one, that they are no worse. Therefore, he cannot think ambition, or love of power, more justly laid to their charge, than to other men's ; because that would be to make religion itself, or at least the best constitution of church-government, answerable for the errors and depravity of human nature.

Within these last two hundred years, all sorts of temporal power have been wrested from the clergy, and much of their ecclesiastic, the reason or justice

of which proceeding I shall not examine ; but that the remedies were a little too violent, with respect to their possessions, the legislature has lately confessed by the remission of their first fruits. Neither do the common libellers deny this, who, in their invectives, only tax the church with an insatiable desire of power and wealth (equally common to all bodies of men as well as individuals), but thank God, that the laws have deprived them of both. However, it is worth observing the justice of parties ; the sects among us are apt to complain, and think it hard usage to be reproached now after fifty years, for overturning the state, for the murder of a king, and the indignity of a usurpation ; yet these very men and their partisans, are continually reproaching the clergy, and laying to their charge, the pride, the avarice, the luxury, the ignorance, and superstition of popish times, for a thousand years past.

He thinks it a scandal to government, that such an unlimited liberty should be allowed of publishing books against those doctrines in religion wherein all christians have agreed ; much more, to connive at such tracts as reject all revelation, and by their consequences, often deny the very being of a God. Surely it is not a sufficient atonement for the writers, that they profess much loyalty to the present government, and sprinkle up and down some arguments in favour of the dissenters ; that they dispute, as strenuously as they can, for liberty of conscience, and inveigh largely against all ecclesiastics under the name of high church ; and, in

short, under the shelter of some popular principles in politics and religion, undermine the foundations of all piety and virtue.

As he does not reckon every schism, of that damnable nature which some would represent, so he is very far from closing with the new opinion of those, who would make it no crime at all; and argue at a wild rate, that God Almighty is delighted with the variety of faith and worship, as he is with the varieties of nature. To such absurdities are men carried by the affectation of free-thinking, and removing the prejudices of education; under which head, they have for some time begun to list morality and religion. It is certain that before the rebellion in 1642, though the number of puritans (as they were then called) were as great as it is with us, and though they affected to follow pastors of that denomination, yet those pastors had episcopal ordination, possessed preferments in the church, and were sometimes promoted to bishopricks themselves. But a breach in the general form of worship, was, in those days, reckoned so dangerous and sinful in itself, and so offensive to Roman catholicks at home and abroad, that it was too unpopular to be attempted; neither, I believe, was the expedient then found out, of maintaining separate pastors out of private purses.

When a schism is once spread in a nation, there grows at length a dispute, which are the schismatics. Without entering on the arguments used by both sides among us, to fix the guilt on each

other, it is certain, that in the sense of the law, the schism lies on that side, which opposes itself to the religion of the state. I leave it among the divines to dilate upon the danger of schism, as a spiritual evil; but I would consider it only as a temporal one. And I think it clear, that any great separation from the established worship, though to a new one that is more pure and perfect, may be an occasion of endangering the public peace; because it will compose a body always in reserve, prepared to follow any discontented heads, upon the plausible pretexts of advancing true religion, and opposing error, superstition, or idolatry. For this reason Plato lays it down as a maxim, that men ought to worship the gods according to the laws of the country; and he introduces Socrates, in his last discourse, utterly disowning the crime laid to his charge, of teaching new divinities or methods of worship. Thus, the poor Hugonots of France were engaged in a civil war, by the specious pretences of some, who, under the guise of religion, sacrificed so many thousand lives to their own ambition and revenge. Thus was the whole body of puritans in England drawn to be instruments or abettors of all manner of villainy, by the artifices of a few men, whose designs, from the first, were levelled to destroy the constitution both of religion and government*. And thus, even in Holland itself, where it is pretended that the variety of sects live so ami-

* See Lord Clarendon's History.

cably together, and in such perfect obedience to the magistrate, it is notorious how a turbulent party, joining with the Arminians, did, in the memory of our fathers, attempt to destroy the liberty of that republick. So that, upon the whole, where sects are tolerated in a state, it is fit they should enjoy a full liberty of conscience, and every other privilege of free-born subjects, to which no power is annexed. And to preserve their obedience upon all emergencies, a government cannot give them too much ease, nor trust them with too little power.

The clergy are usually charged with a persecuting spirit, which they are said to discover by an implacable hatred to all dissenters : and this appears to be more unreasonable, because they suffer less in their interests by a toleration, than any of the conforming laity ; for while the church remains in its present form, no dissenter can possibly have any share in its dignities, revenues, or power ; whereas, by once receiving the sacrament, he is rendered capable of the highest employments in the state. And it is very possible, that a narrow education, together with a mixture of human infirmity, may help to beget among some of the clergy in possession, such an aversion and contempt for all innovators, as physicians are apt to have for empiricks, or lawyers for pettifoggers, or merchants for pedlars ; but since the number of sectaries does not concern the clergy, either in point of interest or conscience, (it being an evil not in their power to remedy), it is more fair and reasonable to suppose,

their dislike proceeds from the dangers they apprehend to the peace of the commonwealth, in the ruin whereof, they must expect to be the first and greatest sufferers.

To conclude this section, it must be observed, that there is a very good word, which has of late suffered much by both parties, I mean moderation; which, the one side, very justly disowns, and the other, as unjustly pretends to. Beside what passes every day in conversation, any man who reads the papers published by Mr. Leslie,* and others of his stamp, must needs conclude, that if this author could make the nation see his adversaries, under the colours he paints them in, we have nothing else to do, but rise as one man, and destroy

* Dr. Charles Leslie, a famous Nonjuring Divine, second son of John Leslie, bishop of Clogher. At the Revolution, he was chancellor of the cathedral of Connor; and left that and his other ecclesiastical preferments, to follow King James's fortunes, and after his death his son's, and made several visits to the courts of St. Germain and Bar le Duc; which, with his writings, have rendered him obnoxious to the government. In the year 1713, he found himself under a necessity of leaving the kingdom, and retiring to the Pretender's court; where he was allowed to officiate in a private chapel, after the manner of the Church of England. He went with the Chevalier into Italy, and about a year before his death returned to England; where, having prepared for the press a collection of his Theological works (of which a large impression was printed, in two volumes, folio, 1721), he went into the North of Ireland, his native country; and died, soon after his arrival, April 13, 1722. He defended the Bishop of Exeter against Mr. Hoadly, in "The Best Answer that ever was made," &c. and was author of the "Rehearsals," and many other political tracts.

such wretches from the face of the earth. On the other side; how shall we excuse the advocates for moderation? among whom, I could appeal to a hundred papers of universal approbation, by the cause they were writ for, which lay such principles to the whole body of the tories, as, if they were true, and believed; our next business should in prudence be, to erect gibbets in every parish, and hang them out of the way. But I suppose it is presumed, the common people understand raillery, or at lest rhetorick, and will not take hyperboles in too literal a sense; which, however, in some junctures, might prove a desperate experiment. And this is moderation in the modern sense of the word, to which, speaking impartially, the bigots of both parties are equally entitled.

SECTION II.

THE SENTIMENTS OF A CHURCH OF ENGLAND MAN, WITH RESPECT TO GOVERNMENT.

WE look upon it as a very just reproach, though we cannot agree where to fix it, that there should be so much violence and hatred in religious matters among men who agree in all fundamentals, and only differ in some ceremonies, or, at most, mere speculative points. Yet, is not this frequently the case between contending parties in a state? For instance; do not the generality of whigs and tories among us, profess to agree in the same fundamentals; their loyalty to the Queen, their abjuration of the Pretender, the settlement of the crown in the Protestant line, and a revolution principle;

their affection to the church established, with toleration of dissenters? nay, sometimes they go farther, and pass over into each other's principles; the whigs become great assertors of the prerogative, and the tories of the people's liberty; these crying down almost the whole set of bishops, and those, defending them; so that the differences fairly stated, would be much of a sort with those in religion among us, and amount to little more than, who should take place, or go in and out first or kiss the Queen's hand; and what are these but a few court ceremonies? or who should be in the ministry; and what is that to the body of the nation, but a mere speculative point? yet I think it must be allowed, that no religious sects ever carried their mutual aversions to greater heights, than our state parties have done; who, the more to inflame their passions, have mixed religious and civil animosities together; borrowing one of their appellations from the church, with the addition of high and low, how little soever their disputes relate to the term as it is generally understood.

I now proceed to deliver the sentiments of a Church of England man, with respect to government.

He does not think the church of England so narrowly calculated, that it cannot fall in with any regular species of government, nor does he think any one regular species of government; more acceptable to God than another. The three generally received in the schools, have all of them their several

perfections, and are subject to their several depravations. However, few states are ruined by any defect in their institution, but generally by the corruption of manners ; against which the best institution is no longer a security ; and without which, a very ill one may subsist and flourish ; whereof there are two pregnant instances now in Europe. The first is, the aristocracy of Venice, which, founded upon the wisest maxims, and digested by a great length of time, has, in our age, admitted so many abuses through the degeneracy of the nobles, that the period of its duration seems to approach. The other is, the united republicks of the States-General, where a vein of temperance, industry, parsimony, and a public spirit, running through the whole body of the people, has preserved an infant commonwealth, of an untimely birth and sickly constitution, for above a hundred years, through so many dangers and difficulties, as a much more healthy one could never have struggled against, without those advantages.

Where security of person and property are preserved by laws, which none but the whole can repeal, there the great ends of government are provided for, whether the administration be in the hands of one, or of many. Where any one person or body of men, who do not represent the whole, seize into their hands the power in the last resort, there is properly no longer a government, but what Aristotle and his followers call the abuse and corruption of one. This distinction excludes arbitrary power, in whatever numbers ; which, notwithstanding all that Hobbes,

Filmer, and others have said to its advantage, I look upon as a greater evil than anarchy itself, as much as a savage is in a happier state of life, than a slave at the oar.

It is reckoned ill-manners, as well as unreasonable, for men to quarrel upon difference in opinion; because that is usually supposed to be a thing, which no man can help in himself; but this I do not conceive to be a universal infallible maxim, except in those cases, where the question is pretty equally disputed among the learned and the wise: where it is otherwise, a man of tolerable reason, some experience, and willing to be instructed, may apprehend he is got into a wrong opinion, though the whole course of his mind and inclination would persuade him to believe it true; he may be convinced that he is in an error, though he does not see where it lies, by the bad effects of it in the common conduct of his life, and by observing those persons, for whose wisdom and goodness he has the greatest deference, to be of a contrary sentiment. According to Hobbes's comparison of reasoning with casting up accounts, whoever finds a mistake in the sum total, must allow himself out, though, after repeated trials, he may not see in which article he has misreckoned. I will instance in one opinion, which I look upon every man obliged in conscience to quit, or in prudence to conceal; I mean, that whoever argues in defence of absolute power in a single person, though he offers the old plausible plea, that it is his opinion, which he cannot help, unless he be convinced,

ought in all free states to be treated as the common enemy of mankind. Yet this is laid as a heavy charge upon the clergy of the two reigns before the revolution, who, under the terms of passive obedience and nonresistance, are said to have preached up the unlimited power of the prince, because they found it a doctrine that pleased the court, and made way for their preferment. And I believe there may be truth enough in this accusation, to convince us, that human frailty will too often interpose itself, among persons of the holiest function. However, it may be offered in excuse for the clergy, that in the best societies there are some ill members, which a corrupted court and ministry will industriously find out, and introduce. Besides, it is manifest, that the greater number of those, who held and preached this doctrine, were misguided by equivocal terms, and by perfect ignorance in the principles of government, which they had not made any part of their study. The question originally put, and as I remember to have heard it disputed in public schools, was this, Whether under any pretence whatsoever it may be lawful to resist the supreme magistrate? which was held in the negative; and this is certainly the right opinion. But many of the clergy, and other learned men, deceived by dubious expression, mistook the object to which passive obedience was due. By the supreme magistrate, is properly understood the legislative power, which in all governments must be absolute and unlimited. But the word magis-

trate, seeming to denote a single person, and to express the executive power, it came to pass, that the obedience due to the legislature, was, for want of knowing or considering this easy distinction, misapplied to the administration. Neither is it any wonder, that the clergy, or other wellmeaning people, should fall into this error, which deceived Hobbes himself so far, as to be the foundation of all the political mistakes in his books; where he perpetually confounds the executive with the legislative power, though all well instituted states have ever placed them in different hands, as may be obvious to those, who know any thing of Athens, Sparta, Thebes, and other republicks of Greece, as well as the greater ones of Carthage and Rome.

Besides, it is to be considered, that when these doctrines began to be preached among us, the kingdom had not quite worn out the memory of that horrid rebellion, under the consequences of which it had groaned almost twenty years. And a weak prince, in conjunction with a succession of most prostitute ministers, began again to dispose the people to new attempts, which it was, no doubt, the clergy's duty to endeavour to prevent; though some of them, for want of knowledge in temporal affairs, and others, perhaps from a worse principle, proceeded upon a topick, that, strictly followed, would enslave all mankind.

Among other theological arguments made use of in those times in praise of monarchy, and justification of absolute obedience to a prince, there

seemed to be one of a singular nature; it was urged, that Heaven was governed by a monarch, who had none to controul his power, but was absolutely obeyed: then it followed, that earthly governments were the more perfect, the nearer they imitated the government in Heaven. All which I look upon as the strongest argument against despotic power, that ever was offered; since no reason can possibly be assigned, why it is best for the world, that God Almighty has such a power, which does not directly prove, that no mortal man should ever have the like.

But though a Church of England man thinks every species of government equally lawful, he does not think them equally expedient; or for every country indifferently. There may be something in the climate, naturally disposing men toward one sort of obedience; as it is manifest all over Asia, where we never read of any commonwealth, except some small ones on the western coasts, established by the Greeks. There may be a great deal in the situation of a country, and in the present genius of the people. It has been observed, that the temperate climates usually run into moderate governments, and the extremes, into despotic power. It is a remark of Hobbes, that the youth of England are corrupted in their principles of government, by reading the authors of Greece and Rome, who writ under commonwealths. But it might have been more fairly offered for the honour of liberty, that while the rest of the known world was overrun

with the arbitrary government of single persons, arts and sciences took their rise, and flourished, only in those few small territories, where the people were free. And though learning may continue after liberty is lost, as it did in Rome for a while, upon the foundations laid under the commonwealth, and the particular patronage of some emperors, yet it hardly ever began under a tyranny in any nation: because slavery is of all things the greatest clog and obstacle to speculation. And indeed, arbitrary power is but the first natural step from anarchy or the savage life, the adjusting of power and freedom being an effect and consequence of maturer thinking: and this is nowhere so duly regulated, as in a limited monarchy; because I believe it may pass for a maxim in state, that the administration cannot be placed in too few hands, nor the legislature in too many. Now, in this material point, the constitution of the English government, far exceeds all others at this time on the earth; to which the present establishment of the church does so happily agree, that I think, whoever is an enemy to either, must of necessity be so to both.

He thinks, as our monarchy is constituted, an hereditary right is much to be preferred before election. Because the government here, especially by some late amendments, is so regularly disposed in all its parts, that it almost executes itself. And therefore, upon the death of a prince among us, the administration goes on without any rub or interruption. For the same reasons, we have less to

apprehend from the weakness or fury of our monarchs, who have such wise councils to guide the first, and laws to restrain the other. And therefore this hereditary right should be kept so sacred, as never to break the succession, unless where the preserving of it may endanger the constitution; which is not from any intrinsic merit, or unalienable right in a particular family, but to avoid the consequences that usually attend the ambition of competitors, to which elective kingdoms are exposed; and which is the only obstacle, to hinder them from arriving at the greatest perfection, that government can possibly reach. Hence appears the absurdity of that distinction, between a king *de facto*, and one *de jure*, with respect to us. For every limited monarch is a king *de jure*, because he governs by the consent of the whole, which is authority sufficient to abolish all precedent right. If a king come in by conquest, he is no longer a limited monarch; if he afterward consent to limitations, he becomes immediately king *de jure*, for the same reason.

The great advocates for succession, who affirm it ought not to be violated upon any regard or consideration whatsoever, do insist much upon one argument, that seems to carry little weight. They would have it, that a crown is a prince's birthright, and ought at least to be as well secured to him and his posterity, as the inheritance of any private man; in short, that he has the same title to his kingdom, which every individual has to his property: now the consequence of this doctrine must be, that as a man

may find several ways to waste, mispend, or abuse his patrimony, without being answerable to the laws : so a king may in like manner do what he will with his own, that is, he may squander and misapply his revenues, and even alienate the crown, without being called to an account by his subjects. They allow such a prince to be guilty indeed of much folly and wickedness, but for these he is answerable to God, as every private man must be, that is guilty of mismanagement in his own concerns. Now, the folly of this reasoning will best appear by applying it in a parallel case : should any man argue, that a physician is supposed to understand his own art best ; that the law protects and encourages his profession ; and therefore, although he should manifestly prescribe poison to all his patients, whereof they should immediately die, he cannot be justly punished, but is answerable only to God : or should the same be offered in behalf of a divine, who would preach against religion and moral duties ; in either of these two cases, every body would find out the sophistry, and presently answer, that although common men are not exactly skilled in the composition or application of medicines, or in prescribing the limits of duty ; yet the difference between poisons and remedies, is easily known by their effects ; and common reason soon distinguishes between virtue and vice : and it must be necessary to forbid both these the farther practice of their professions, because their crimes are not purely personal to the physician or the divine, but destructive to the public. All which is

infinitely stronger in respect to a prince, in whose good or ill conduct, the happiness or misery of a whole nation is included : whereas it is of small consequence to the public, farther than example, how any private person manages his property.

By granting that the right of a lineal successor to a crown, were upon the same foot with the property of a subject ; still it may at any time be transferred by the legislative power, as other properties frequently are. The supreme power in a state can do no wrong, because whatever that does, is the action of all : and when the lawyers apply this maxim to the king, they must understand it only in that sense, as he is administrator of the supreme power ; otherwise it is not universally true, but may be controlled in several instances easy to produce.

And these are the topics we must proceed upon, to justify our exclusion of the young Pretender in France ; that of his suspected birth being merely popular, and therefore not made use of, as I remember, since the revolution, in any speech, vote, or proclamation, where there was an occasion to mention him.

As to the abdication of King James, which the advocates on that side look upon to have been forcible and unjust, and consequently void in itself, I think a man may observe every article of the English church, without being in much pain about it. It is not unlikely that all doors were laid open for his departure, and perhaps not without the privacy of the Prince of Orange, as reasonably con-

cluding, that the kingdom might be better settled in his absence: but to affirm he had any cause to apprehend the same treatment with his father, is an improbable scandal flung upon the nation, by a few bigotted French scribblers, or the invidious assertion of a ruined party at home, in the bitterness of their souls; not one material circumstance agreeing with those in 1648; and the greatest part of the nation having preserved the utmost horror for that ignominious murder; but whether his removal were caused by his own fears, or other men's artifices, it is manifest to me, that supposing the throne to be vacant, which was the foot the nation went upon, the body of the people was thereupon left at liberty to choose what form of government they pleased, by themselves, or their representatives.

The only difficulty of any weight against the proceedings at the revolution, is an obvious objection, to which the writers upon that subject have not yet given a direct or sufficient answer, as if they were in pain at some consequences, which they apprehend those of the contrary opinion might draw from it. I will repeat this objection, as it was offered me some time ago, with all its advantages, by a very pious, learned, and worthy gentleman of the non-juring party.*

* This worthy layman, generally distinguished by the appellation of "the pious Mr. Nelson," was born June 22, 1656; educated at St. Paul's school; and removed thence to Trinity College, Cambridge. He contracted an early acquaintance with Abp. Tillotson, which ended but with the life of the latter, who expired

The force of his argument turned upon this ; that the laws made by the supreme power, cannot otherwise than by the supreme power be annulled ; that this consisting in England of a king, lords, and commons, whereof each have a negative voice, no two of them, can repeal or enact a law, without consent of the third ; much less may any one of them be entirely excluded from its part of the legislature, by a vote of the other two. That all these maxims were openly violated at the revolution ; where an assembly of the nobles and people, not summoned by the king's writ, (which was an essential part of the constitution) and consequently no lawful meeting, did merely, upon their own authority, declare the king to have abdicated, the throne vacant, and gave the crown by a vote to a nephew, when there were three children to inherit ; though by the fundamental laws of the realm, the next heir is immediately to succeed. Neither does it appear, how a prince's abdication can make any other sort of vacancy in the throne, than would be caused by his death ; since he cannot abdicate for

in Mr. Nelson's arms. From principle, he long adhered to the communion of the deprived bishops ; but, on the death of Bishop Lloyd, in 1709, returned to that of the church of England. He died Jan. 16, 1714-15 ; and left his whole estate to pious and charitable uses, particularly to charity-schools. He published many valuable and pious works ; his " Companion for Festivals and Fasts, &c." his " Great Duty of frequenting the Christian Sacrifice," and his little Tract " on Confirmation," in particular, deserve, and have received, the highest commendations.

his children, (who claim their right of succession by act of parliament,) otherwise than by his own consent in form to a bill from the two houses.

And this is the difficulty, that seems chiefly to stick with the most reasonable of those, who, from a mere scruple of conscience, refuse to join with us upon the revolution principle; but for the rest, are, I believe, as far from loving arbitrary government, as any others can be, who are born under a free constitution, and are allowed to have the least share of common good sense.

In this objection there are two questions included: first, whether upon the foot of our constitution, as it stood in the reign of the late King James, a king of England may be deposed? The second is, whether the people of England, convened by their own authority, after the king had withdrawn himself in the manner he did, had power to alter the succession.

As for the first, it is a point I shall not presume to determine; and shall therefore only say, that to any man who holds the negative, I would demand the liberty of putting the case as strongly as I please. I will suppose a prince limited by laws like ours, yet running into a thousand caprices of cruelty like Nero or Caligula; I will suppose him to murder his mother and his wife; to commit incest, to ravish matrons; to blow up the senate, and burn his metropolis; openly to renounce God and Christ, and worship the devil: these and the like exorbitances, are in the power of a single person to commit, without the advice of a ministry, or assistance of

an army. And if such a king, as I have described, cannot be deposed but by his own consent in parliament, I do not well see how he can be resisted, or what can be meant by a limited monarchy; or what signifies the people's consent in making and repealing laws, if the person who administers, has no tie but conscience, and is answerable to none but God. I desire no stronger proof that an opinion must be false, than to find very great absurdities annexed to it; and there cannot be greater than in the present case; for it is not a bare speculation that kings may run into such enormities as are abovementioned; the practice may be proved by examples, not only drawn from the first Cæsars, or later emperors, but many modern princes of Europe; such as Peter the cruel, Philip the second of Spain, John Basilovits of Muscovy, and in our own nation, King John, Richard the third, and Henry the eighth. But there cannot be equal absurdities supposed in maintaining the contrary opinion; because it is certain, that princes have it in their power to keep a majority on their side, by any tolerable administration, till provoked by continual oppressions; no man indeed can then answer, where the madness of the people will stop.

As to the second part of the objection; whether the people of England convened by their own authority, upon King James's precipitate departure, had power to alter the succession?

In answer to this, I think it is manifest from the practice of the wisest nations, and who seem to have

had the truest notions of freedom, that when a prince was laid aside for maladministration, the nobles, and people, if they thought it necessary for the public weal, did resume the administration of the supreme power, (the power itself having been always in them,) and did not only alter the succession, but often the very form of government too ; because they believed there was no natural right in one man to govern another, but that all was by institution, force, or consent. Thus, the cities of Greece, when they drove out their tyrannical kings, either chose others from a new family, or abolished the kingly government, and became free states. Thus the Romans, upon the expulsion of Tarquin, found it inconvenient for them to be subject any longer to the pride, the lust, the cruelty and arbitrary will of single persons, and therefore, by general consent, entirely altered the whole frame of their government. Nor do I find the proceedings of either, in this point, to have been condemned by any historian of the succeeding ages.

But a great deal has been already said by other writers upon this invidious and beaten subject ; therefore I shall let it fall ; though the point is commonly mistaken, especially by the lawyers ; who, of all others, seem least to understand the nature of government in general ; like under-workmen, who are expert enough at making a single wheel in a clock, but are utterly ignorant how to adjust the several parts, or regulate the movements.

To return therefore from this digression : it is a Church of England man's opinion, that the freedom

of a nation consists in an absolute unlimited legislative power, wherein the whole body of the people are fairly represented ; and in an executive duly limited ; because on this side likewise, there may be dangerous degrees, and a very ill extreme. For, when two parties in a state are pretty equal in power, pretensions, merit, and virtue, (for these two last are with relation to parties and a court, quite different things) it has been the opinion of the best writers upon government, that a prince ought not in any sort to be under the guidance or influence of either : because he declines by this means from his office of presiding over the whole, to be the head of a party ; which, beside the indignity, renders him answerable for all public mismanagements, and the consequences of them ; and in whatever state this happens, there must either be a weakness in the prince or ministry ; or else the former is too much restrained by the nobles, or those who represent the people.

To conclude : a Church of England man may, with prudence and a good conscience, approve the professed principles of one party more than the other, according as he thinks they best promote the good of church and state ; but he will never be swayed by passion or interest, to advance an opinion, merely because it is that of the party he most approves ; which one single principle, he looks upon as the root of all our civil animosities. To enter into a party, as into an order of friars, with so resigned an obedience to superiors, is very unsuitable both with

the civil and religious liberties we so zealously assert. Thus the understandings of a whole senate are often enslaved by three or four leaders on each side, who, instead of intending the public weal, have their hearts wholly set upon ways and means, how to get or to keep employments. But to speak more at large, how has this spirit of faction mingled itself with the mass of the people, changed their nature and manners, and the very genius of the nation ! broke all the laws of charity, neighbourhood, alliance, and hospitality ; destroyed all ties of friendship, and divided families against themselves ! and no wonder it should be so, when in order to find out the character of a person, instead of inquiring whether he be a man of virtue, honour, piety, wit, good sense, or learning ; the modern question is only, whether he be a whig or a tory ; under which terms, all good and ill qualities are included.

Now, because it is a point of difficulty to choose an exact middle between two ill extremes, it may be worth inquiring in the present case, which of these a wise and good man would rather seem to avoid : taking therefore their own good and ill characters, with due abatements and allowances for partiality and passion, I should think, that in order to preserve the constitution entire in church and state, whoever has a true value for both, would be sure to avoid the extremes of whig, for the sake of the former ; and the extremes of tory, on account of the latter.

I have now said all that I could think convenient, upon so nice a subject, and find I have the ambition

common with other reasoners, to wish at least that both parties may think me in the right ; which would be of some use to those who have any virtue left, but are blindly drawn into the extravagancies of either, upon false representations, to serve the ambition or malice of designing men, without any prospect of their own. But if that is not to be hoped for, my next wish should be, that both might think me in the wrong : which I would understand as an ample justification of myself, and a sure ground to believe, that I have proceeded at least with impartiality, and perhaps with truth.

A TRUE CHURCHMAN SET IN A JUST
AND CLEAR LIGHT;

OR,

AN ESSAY TOWARDS THE RIGHT CHARACTER OF A
FAITHFUL SON OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

BY DR. EDWARD SYNGE,

ARCHBISHOP OF TUAM IN IRELAND.

SIR,

WHEN, the other day, at Mr. B.'s lodging, to one that asked me whether I were a *high* or a *low churchman*, I made answer that I hoped I was neither; for that I so well approved of the constitution of our church, as far as I understood it, that, with God's blessing, I was fully resolved in all things to conform to it, and willingly to act neither *above* nor *below* it; and that therefore, with relation to the established church, I would own no other title but that of a *true churchman*: you may remember you said you would gladly know from me the exact character of such a *true churchman*, and how he is to be distinguished from both the others. In return to which request of yours, I here send you the most faithful draught that I am able to make, according to the best of my apprehensions of him: but how he is to be distinguished, and in what and how many things he differs from the *high* or *low*

churchman; or whether he differs at all from the honest and sincere men of both appellations, I must leave to your own determination, having never yet been able to find any exact and settled meaning of these terms, to which both the contending parties, that use them, will agree.

By a *churchman* we all mean a *christian who embraces the communion of the established church*: to this add the word *true*, and then the character of a *true churchman* will be, first, that he is a *true christian*; and secondly, that he *truly, and not in pretence only, embraces the communion of the established church*.

First then, *a true churchman is a true christian*: that is to say, he unfeignedly, not only in the general, believes that the religion which was taught by Jesus Christ, and his Apostles, is the true religion; but also embraces and gives his assent to every doctrine that appears from the Holy Scriptures to have been taught by them: and where any doubt arises concerning the sense of Scripture, he not only endeavours to clear it by comparing parallel places, but also pays a great deference, in all such cases, to the opinion of the ancient fathers of the christian church; who being men of great and undoubted integrity, and also living, some in the Apostles' time, and others very near it, must needs be very proper judges of the true meaning of what they both taught and writ. Nor is it to him an objection against any such doctrine, that the thing is above his reason, or that he cannot frame a clear

and adequate notion in his mind of it : for although it is absolutely impossible for a rational being to give his assent to contradictions, or consequently, to believe any thing which plainly appears to be contrary to the evident principles of reason : yet considering, that as long as we are in this world, *we know but in part, and prophesy in part*, 1 Cor. xiii. 9. And *we see* (almost all things indeed, as some late philosophers have undertaken to prove, but more especially the things of God) but as *through a glass*; that is, *darkly*, ἐν αἰνίγματι, as it were *in a riddle*, as the margin of our Bibles has it, v. 12. Considering this, I say, he is well assured that many things may be, and are true, which yet are beyond or very difficult to his conception : and therefore thinks himself bound to believe whatsoever God has delivered in his holy word, according to the usual meaning and acceptation of the terms or expressions, although he has but very obscure and analogous notions of the things so delivered.

Again, as a true christian, he not only assents to and believes whatever he can find that God has declared ; but he also makes it his great care and study, first, to know, and then conscientiously to practise, all and every part of his duty. What God has commanded he will not willingly omit : what he has forbidden he will not do, or comply with : in those things where the law of God has determined nothing, to the best of his knowledge and power, he acts according to the rules of christian prudence, so as to give as little offence to any

one as possibly he can : and where lawful authority enacts any thing that is not contrary to the laws of God, he gives obedience to it, *not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.*

Nor lastly, does our *churchman*, as a *christian*, think it enough to have a true faith, and himself to lead a good and godly life; but he judges it to be an inseparable property of true godliness, in his station, to do whatever in him lies, in order to bring others also to the same profession and practice: and therefore he takes care not only to be *holy*, but also *exemplary* in his life! and to *let his light so shine before men, that they seeing his good works, may follow his example*; and thereby advance the honour of his church and religion; *and glorify his Father which is in Heaven*, Matth. v. 16. Nor does he fail, as occasion offers (besides shewing in his life a good example), to make use of sober and modest reproofs, admonitions, and whatever other means may be proper for him, to stop the course of vice and infidelity, and promote the practice of true virtue and piety, amongst all persons whatsoever, with whom he has any intercourse or converse.

Thus does our *true churchman* make it the first and chief part of his care, not only to be, but also (as far as without pride or affectation he may) to *appear a serious and true christian*. And although he cannot but *rejoice* whenever he finds the interest of the church to be promoted, although it be done even by wicked men; as St. Paul did, that Christ

was preached, though not sincerely, but in pretence, and out of envy, strife, and contention, Phil. i. 18; yet wherever a man is known to be tainted with any principles, or to allow himself in any omissions or practices that are contrary to, or inconsistent with, the purity and strictness of the Gospel; however zealous he may appear for the church, yet he can never look upon him as a true churchman, any more than St. Paul did upon those envious and contentious preachers as good Christians. And thus much for the first part of our churchman's character; he is a true Christian. I proceed to the

Second, which is, that he truly embraces the Communion of the established Church. That is to say,

First, he unfeignedly believes, that in the Communion of our Church, as by law established, nothing is wanting that is necessary to eternal salvation. He is fully persuaded that we embrace all the articles of the Christian faith; teach all the rules of a pious and good life, and omit no part of Christ's institution in the administration either of Baptism or the Lord's Supper: nor does he apprehend any more to be necessary to any man's salvation, besides a true faith, a holy life, to be regularly admitted into the church by baptism, and to partake of the benefits of Christ's passion, by a due participation of that bread and that cup which he himself has appointed for that purpose. And therefore a true churchman thinks he may safely challenge all the world to prove that any thing is

or can be necessary for the attainment of everlasting happiness, which is not as effectually to be had in the established Church, as in any society of Christians in the world.

Secondly, *he is no less unfeignedly of opinion that our church requires nothing that is, or can be a hindrance of salvation, from any one who communicates with her.* He knows nothing that can obstruct the salvation of any man, but *sin*; nor can he allow any thing to be a *sin*, but what is *a transgression of God's law*, 1 Joh. iii. 4. *For where there is no law there is no transgression*, Rom. iv. 15. that is to say, no sin. Here therefore he requires our adversaries to produce any one *law of God*, and to shew that any thing prescribed by our church, is either expressly or by good consequence contrary thereunto: and until this be done (which, though often demanded, never yet has been done) however some things in our constitution may be plausibly declaimed against by some that are disaffected to it; (and what almost is there against which ingenious men cannot frame some sort of objections) yet as long as nothing is therein to be found; but what, upon the strictest examination, will abide the test of God's law: he concludes that there is no manner of sin, and therefore no obstacle to salvation in our communion. And therefore when he finds our adversaries, with much noise and seeming pomp, dressing up their objections against the established church in hard words, and obscure and doubtful expressions; such as *Po-*

pery, or symbolizing with Papists, will-worship, superstition, significant or symbolical ceremonies, making of new sacraments, and the like : he takes it for a certain sign that they dare not set their cause in the true light, and therefore endeavour, as much as they can, to perplex and darken it by such phrases as are beyond the understanding of the common people, whom they endeavour to frighten with such visors as men of sense and thought may well despise. For let them but once clearly and distinctly tell us what they mean by Popery, will-worship, superstition, &c. and then shew that those things, in the notion they explain them, are contrary to some law of God, which they must produce; and lastly, that our church is guilty of these things, or any one of them, in that very same notion; and then they will take the right way to make it appear, that there is just ground for their separation from her. But since this never has, nor, as he thinks, can be done, he is of opinion, that neither a churchman, nor indeed any man that is impartial, can see any just reason for refusing any thing that is in itself lawful, and required by lawful authority, only because some men who are disaffected to our constitution, are pleased to give it a hard and odious name. For not the name, but the nature of a thing must always be our direction in the acceptance or refusal of it.

And here if we impartially, and without prejudice, do but consider the true nature of those constitutions of our church that are so much cried out

against (which must chiefly be gathered from the *design* and intention of the church itself in appointing them) it may well raise our wonder how it is possible for men of candour and ingenuity to frame any objection against the *lawfulness* of them. In all public transactions, whether sacred or civil, it has ever been found, if not absolutely necessary, yet highly expedient, to fix and determine some certain outward rites and observances; sometimes for the distinction of persons one from another, sometimes for the preservation of order and regularity, and sometimes as signs and tokens, or memorials of what is or ought to be the design of the person or persons that perform or are engaged in such a transaction. And where God himself has not fixed and determined these outward things (as in most cases he did in the Jewish church) either custom, or positive human authority has always been found more or less to have done it. Of this, in civil matters, the instances are notorious, as the difference of garments and robes for the distinction of sexes, qualities, and stations; the formalities observed in passing of laws, and electing and inaugurating of magistrates; signing, sealing and delivering of writings in token of the reality of intention in the parties who thereby bind and oblige themselves; and (to omit other instances) the giving of a twig and a sod in token of livery of seisin of land. Then, as for things sacred, what Christian church is there upon earth that has not some rites or ceremonies, or outward observances, either by law or

custom established among them for the ends above-mentioned? Read but the first section of Mr. Durel's Book, entituled, *A View of the Government and Public Worship of God in the reformed Churches beyond the Seas*; and it will give you abundant satisfaction in this point. And even our own Dissenters, who endeavour to represent our rites and ceremonies with such a formidable aspect, have not with all their care been able to keep themselves free from some things of the like nature. Thus for example, their *Directory for public worship* plainly supposes an appointment of time and place for such worship, and expressly settles the method in which it is to be performed: in the celebration of the Lord's Supper it prescribes the posture of sitting, and in matrimony the ceremony of joining of hands; their *solemn league and covenant* (to which they *swore*) was ordered to be taken *with hands lifted up*: and though all Dissenters that own the lawfulness of taking an oath, do allow it to be an act of *religious worship* (that is to say, whereby we express the honour and reverence we have for God) yet I never could hear of any of them who made the least scruple of the ceremony of laying the hand upon the Holy Bible and kissing it, as a *sign* or *token* of the solemn calling of God to witness. And now, after all this, how strange is it that such great fault should be found with our church, and even a separation made from it, on account of such very things as these, no way unlawful in themselves, and appointed only and alto-

gether for the decent and laudable ends above-mentioned. For it is notorious, that we place no intrinsic holiness in a linen garment; only the church appoints a surplice to be worn by the minister that officiates, as a decent distinction between him and the people: our rubrick expressly declares, that by kneeling at the Holy Communion *no adoration is intended either to the bread and wine, or to any corporeal presence of the natural flesh and blood of Christ.* But that *this order is meant for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ, &c.* nor is the cross after baptism appointed for any other purpose but expressly as a *token, or memorial to all persons baptized, that they be not ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, &c.* It is not my design here to descend to the particulars of this controversy: but our church, in the short discourse of *ceremonies* before the book of *Common Prayer*, having expressly owned that her ceremonies *have been devised by men*, and therefore are not obtruded upon the people as of divine institution; that they are retained amongst us *for a decent order in the church, and because they pertain to edification—and to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God*; and therefore are not by any to be looked upon as new sacraments or instruments of conveying God's grace to us; and that *the keeping or omitting of a ceremony in itself considered, is but a small thing*; but *the wilful and contemptuous transgression, and breaking of a*

common order and discipline, is in this case, the *offence before God*. Our church, I say, having made this clear and full declaration of her meaning, he that shall yet condemn any of her rites or ceremonies as *unlawful*, must at the same time also condemn kneeling, lifting up the hands or eyes in prayer, joining of hands in marriage, kissing of the book in taking of an oath, and whatever else either law or custom has established, either here or anywhere else, in religious performances, for the same ends that our church has proposed in the appointing or retaining of all or any of such her constitutions. But to return from this digression.

Thirdly, *it is in like manner, the settled judgment of our churchman, that wherever a church by lawful authority established, neither wants any thing that is necessary to salvation, nor requires any thing that is a hindrance of it ; with such a church it is lawful for any Christian to join in communion.* And consequently, that the communion of our church neither is, nor can be looked upon as unlawful ; except a man should be so absurd as to say, that it may be unlawful to do a thing, though no law of God or man has any way (whether expressly or by consequence) forbidden it.

Fourthly and lastly, and since it is beyond dispute the duty of every Christian to do whatsoever *lawfully* he may for the maintaining the peace and unity both of the church universal, and also of each and every part of it ; *it is also the opinion and judgment of our churchman, that wherever the com-*

munion of an established church is lawful and sufficient to salvation; there of necessity it must be unlawful to set up any separate church or congregation in opposition to her. For if once it be allowed, as lawful, thus to divide from such a church, it will, he thinks, be impossible to find out any rule or principle upon which to put a stop to perpetual divisions after divisions, as men's fancies may incline them farther and farther to depart from each other, until every single man comes to stand separate by himself, and no such thing as a Christian society or congregation remains upon the earth; and yet no man to be blamed for this separation: which how it can consist with the notion of a church or congregation, ἐκκλησία, or the illustrations of that notion, which we meet with in Holy Scripture, from a body and its members; a kingdom, a city, a family, and the people that compose it, a sheepfold, with divers others, which all do denote that unity and society which all Christians are obliged to maintain and keep up one with another, he leaves to the serious consideration of those men, whose practices cannot be justified but upon such dividing principles: and therefore it is with him an undoubted conclusion, that to divide from the established church of England, as it now stands, or to set up any other church or congregation in opposition to her, within those precincts where she is so established, is altogether sinful and unlawful. And thus much for the second part of a true churchman's character, which is, that he truly

embraces the communion of the established church. Give me leave, from what has been said, to draw the three following corollaries.

First, whereas, in some things that are confessedly not necessary to salvation, many learned men of several churches have carried their opinions farther than what their church has ever, by any public act, decreed or determined. If we suppose the case to be the same amongst ourselves, as perhaps it may; yet *a man that receives and embraces whatever our church has, by any authentic act or decree, established or determined, may be, and is a true churchman (that is to say, a true Christian, and one who truly embraces the communion of the established church) although in such other things, as I have but now mentioned, he should happen to be of a different judgment from the private opinion of never so many of our greatest divines.*

Secondly, whereas it is allowed, on all sides, that our rites and ceremonies, and some other things, by our ecclesiastical laws enacted, are in their own nature indifferent, and but of human institution, ordained and appointed for the sake of decency and order, and the avoiding of confusion and irregularity. *He that conscientiously conforms to whatever of that nature is established amongst us (as being lawful in itself, and appointed by lawful authority) is yet a true churchman, although he may be of opinion that several of these same [indifferent] things may be altered for the better; and accordingly endeavours, in a peaceable, modest, and Chris-*

tion way, to get them so altered by the same authority that at first established them. And though in this his opinion he should be mistaken; yet is he nevertheless a *true churchman*: it being no part of the character of such a man to be free from all manner of error. But except it appears very clearly to him that the thing is really so *indifferent*, he will neither attempt, nor so much as give his consent that any alteration should be made in it. For though his charity is such, that he will not *condemn* any church or single person, but where he has *clearly and plainly* the law of God of his side, yet where he finds any thing to be *settled*; and but even probable arguments to induce him to think that it may be of divine or apostolick institution; he is sure it is the safest way to let it stand as it is: and whatever alterations he endeavours or consents to, it is always with a design to promote piety, peace and unity among Christians, and neither to raise any unnecessary controversy in the church, nor so much as *seemingly* to encroach upon the authority of Christ or his apostles. And farther, before he will consent to any alteration, even in such things as are undoubtedly indifferent, he carefully weighs the probable consequences of such an attempt, and considers, First, that if we have not beforehand a reasonable assurance of some good that will follow from it, it ought to be let alone; because possibly it may produce some evil, though every man cannot easily foresee it. Secondly, that the good which is aimed at by promoting such an altera-

tion in our church (that is to say, an union with the Dissenters) can with no assurance be expected from it, except some reasonable number of those who dissent from us, do beforehand positively and particularly declare, that they will be satisfied, and join in communion with us upon the making of it: and thirdly, that as well-meaning Dissenters, through mistake or weakness, do take offence at our innocent and decent ceremonies; so on the other side there may, possibly, amongst ourselves be many of the like complexion, who would be equally offended at the alteration of some of them: and to run the hazard of a disturbance within ourselves; and, it may be, the loss of many of our own members, while we are not sure of gaining as many others over to us as may counterbalance this danger, is what a *true churchman* will by no means consent to. And therefore, upon the whole he concludes, that *all manner of alterations in the church, as well as in the state, ought to be cautiously and thoroughly considered, both in themselves and their consequences, before they are made or attempted.*

Thirdly, a man may be a true churchman (according to the definition laid down) *although he consents and desires that a toleration may be granted to those that are of a different persuasion from him in matters of religion.* For although he, for his part, is abundantly convinced that he cannot be in a surer and safer way to eternal salvation, than in the communion of the established church; yet to compel others (who are not under the like conviction) by

any penalties to be inflicted either on their bodies or goods, to profess or practise what they solemnly declare to be against their conscience, he judges to be neither reasonable nor agreeable to the rules of the Gospel. But then, as he is a faithful subject to the *civil state*, as well as a sincere member of the *established church*, he never can *willingly* yield to such a toleration as may endanger the ruin or downfall of the one or other: and therefore, although no man can be hindered from thinking whatever he pleases; nor ought any one to be compelled to profess a religion, or to worship God any way that he is persuaded is unlawful; yet our *churchman* does not think it reasonable that all men that please should be allowed to gather congregations, and there to teach and preach whatever doctrine they shall think fit. For this would be not only a *toleration*, but even an *invitation* and encouragement to every man that were ingenious, and not sufficiently awed by conscience, if he could not be employed or preferred to his mind in the church, to set up for himself; and not only to endeavour to gain such a number of disciples as may support and maintain him, but also to strengthen himself and his party, by sowing division and distraction among those from whom he has divided: which, however, at first, it may seem only to threaten the *church*, yet will soon be found (as dear bought experience assures us) to have a very evil influence upon the state also. Neither does he judge it fit that any toleration should *willingly* be granted, and much less encouragement given, to

those whose principles or practices do shew that they would not tolerate the established church, if the power were in their hands; except they first do renounce and disown such principles and practices. For if it be in my power to keep a man's hands tied and his tongue quiet; I ought not, in common prudence, to let loose the one or the other, until I am sufficiently assured that he will not make use of them, upon the first opportunity, to my ruin and destruction. And therefore much less will a *true churchman* give his consent that any part of the civil or military power should be put into the hands of such men, whose interest, inclination or conscience can hardly be supposed to allow them to be impartial to the established church in the administration of it. For (whatever necessity may sometimes compel them to) he believes there never was any kingdom or commonwealth (who were true to their profession) that at any time have *made it their choice* to put into places of considerable trust or power, any such persons as have professed to believe the established religion or worship to be unlawful, and consequently must think themselves in conscience obliged to endeavour what they can the alteration of it.

But there are two things yet, concerning which, I remember, you desired particularly to know the *naked and undisguised thoughts* of a *true churchman*: the first is the *late revolution*, with the consequences thereof, namely King William's accession to the throne, and her present Majesty's to the crown of these her kingdoms. But because a few men, who

once were members of the established church, but now have separated themselves from her, do disapprove of the *late revolution*, and refuse to swear allegiance to the present government ; therefore to suspect even those who have been constant and firm to the interest both of King William and her present Majesty, always prayed for them, as their sovereigns, in their public worship, and have sworn allegiance and fidelity to them, in opposition to all competitors or pretenders whatsoever : to suspect, I say, such persons as these, as if they were not well affected to the Queen or her title ; if some very good ground be not produced for such a suspicion, I think is very highly uncharitable. It is possible that men who are very different in their *hypotheses* concerning the ground and original of civil power, may yet, in their *practice*, agree in being very faithful and loyal to that particular government under which they at one time live : and therefore as long as you cannot tax a man with any thing that is *disloyal*, either in his words or actions, you ought not, by any means, to endeavour to bring him under such a suspicion ; because in point of *speculation*, he perhaps proceeds upon a different scheme of principles from that which you have laid down to yourself. However, to give you all the satisfaction I can in this matter, I here present you with the *naked and undisguised thoughts* both of myself and other *true churchmen*, as far as I am acquainted with them, touching this whole matter, which are as follows.

First, that *the late* King James, by refusing to

govern his subjects according to the fundamental laws and constitutions of the realm (to which legal government only his people were obliged to submit) and by assuming to himself an illegal and arbitrary power (which was in effect the setting up of a new kingdom or government, to which his subjects were no way bound to yield or give obedience). And lastly, by withdrawing himself from the kingdom, rather than yield that those laws and constitutions which he had infringed, should again be restored to their due force; *did really*, and in the strictest propriety of sense, *abdicate the government* (that is to say, that government with which alone he was legally invested) *and consequently, did leave the throne vacant*; as was voted by the Commons, and agreed to by the Lords in Convention assembled in January and February 1688-9.

Secondly, that by the fundamental law of self-preservation (which must always take place in such cases, where the laws of the land have not made sufficient provision for the public safety) *the people of England had a right to fill the vacant throne, and to put the abdicated government into such hands as might be most for the common safety*. For, for them to have remained in the same condition that King James left them in, until he had returned again to them at the head of an army, had been evidently to give way to their own ruin and destruction; which sure they were not obliged to do: nor was it possible for so great a body of men, even for a small time, to subsist with any security to themselves;

without some established government, as well to rule them within themselves, as to protect them from their enemies abroad.

Thirdly, as it is morally impossible for so great a number of men, as the people of England then were, to transact any business jointly in their own proper persons; so, by the fundamental constitution of the kingdom, the Houses of Lords and Commons, when met together, were the only legal representatives of the whole body of the nation, in the circumstances they then were; the King having withdrawn himself, and refused to exert his legal power amongst them: and therefore whatsoever a majority of both Houses did agree to, was to be construed and esteemed as the act of the whole people; especially, if afterwards it was acquiesced in, and thereby consented to, by the generality of the nation itself. Since then the Lords and Commons so met, did, upon King James's abdication, place our late sovereign King William on the throne, and the generality of the people did acquiesce in his government; it follows that *King William thereby became our rightful and lawful King*; and consequently that *our present gracious sovereign Queen Anne* (who legally succeeds him) *is our rightful and lawful Queen.*

Fourthly and lastly, since the supreme legislative power, in every kingdom and commonwealth, has no authority over it, whereby it may be controuled, but that of God and his laws; and the particular form of government, or rule of succession, in any civil state, is not settled or determined by any law of

God's making: it undeniably follows, that in every kingdom, the supreme legislative power may limit the succession to the crown or sovereignty, within themselves, according as shall be found most advisable for the good of the community. From whence the consequence is, that *in all ages to come, whosoever is, or shall be, king or queen of these realms, BY LAW, is to be owned and looked upon as rightful and lawful king or queen of the same.*

The other thing, concerning which you desired to know the naked and undisguised thoughts of a *true churchman* was the *necessity of episcopal government* in the Christian church; together with the consequences of that doctrine, as well with respect to the foreign churches abroad, as to our Dissenters at home; whose ecclesiastical polity is framed after a different model: in answer whereunto, I here freely give you my judgment, as far as is necessary for the present purpose.

First, then, *it is*, I think allowed, by all who soberly profess Christianity, to be of *Divine appointment, that the Christian religion should publicly be taught and preached* (not as a philosophical doctrine, which any man of learning may teach in a school, but authoritatively proposed to the consciences of the people, as a law revealed and given by God), *Baptism and the Lord's Supper be administred, and discipline* (for the punishing of offenders with ecclesiastical censures, and excluding such as are obstinate from the communion of the faithful) *duly exercised.* [See the Postscript, and compare it with what follows.]

Secondly, where any work is *by divine appointment* to be performed, the persons, who perform the work, must, *ordinarily and regularly*, derive their power for so doing from God himself. For, who but he, that has authority to appoint the work to be done, can give a sufficient power to any one to take it in hand? *Ordinarily and regularly*, I say; for, as for cases of extraordinary necessity, how far, in them a man may presume upon God's *approbation* of an action, for the doing of which he has not, in a regular way, received any power, is a point that does not come under our present consideration. In the *ordinary and regular* method therefore of things, *Whosoever takes upon him to be a public teacher or preacher of the Gospel, to administer Baptism or the Lord's Supper, or to exercise ecclesiastical discipline in the church of Christ, must originally derive his power for so doing from none other but God himself.*

Thirdly, that the power of performing all these offices was, at the first foundation of the Christian church, given by our blessed Saviour to the Twelve Apostles, by them to be communicated to other proper persons; is what I am sure you will not deny: from whence it will follow, that *in whatsoever frame or method the Apostles did settle the polity of the church, in order to the constant and continual performance of all the said offices, the same ought to be preserved intire* (as far as possibly can be) *in all succeeding ages.* Or in other terms; however lawful and necessary it may be, to regulate the *undetermined circumstances* even of a divine institution,

according to the rules of prudence, and the present exigence of things; yet, wherever it appears that any thing has been established by the Apostles themselves, (who are allowed to have had their mission and commission immediately from Christ;) no manner of change, by any human authority, ought ever to be made in any *substantial part* of such an establishment: whatever in cases of *extraordinary necessity* (of which I am not now speaking) may perhaps sometimes innocently be submitted to, or complied with.

Fourthly, (to speak in the words of the learned Mr. Chillingworth) *if we abstract from Episcopal Government all accidentals, and consider only what is essential and necessary to it, we shall find in it no more but this: an appointment of one man of eminent sanctity and sufficiency, to have the care of all the churches within a certain precinct or diocese, and furnishing him with authority (not absolute or arbitrary, but regulated and bounded by laws, and moderated by joining to him a convenient number of assistants) to the intent that all the churches under him may be provided of good and able pastors: and that, both of pastors and people, conformity to laws, and performance of their duties may be required, under penalties, not left to discretion, but by law appointed.* Apost. Instit. of Episc. Demonstr. Sect. ii.

Fifthly, *that this government was received universally in the church, either in the Apostles' time, or presently after, is so evident and unquestionable,*

that the most learned adversaries of this government do themselves confess it. As you may find by the testimonies quoted, Ibid. Sect. iii.

From whence, sixthly, I cannot but conclude with the same learned author, Sect. vi. that *seeing episcopal government is confessedly so ancient and so Catholick, it cannot with reason be denied to be Apostolick.* No possible account being to be given, how a change from that frame of church polity, which the Apostles had laid, should *immediately* after their time (if not while some of them were alive) come to be *universally* received throughout the Christian world: and that not only without the least opposition, but even any manner of notice taken, by any writer, of that time or since, that any such change there was. As he most convincingly argues in the remaining part of that short discourse, which I earnestly recommend to your reading.

The designed brevity of this letter will not permit me more largely to insist on this point: only this I will add, that if we allow the *universal practice* of the primitive church to be a good comment upon those passages of Holy Scripture that relate to this matter, no impartial man, I think, can deny that *episcopal government* (as I have but now stated it in the words of Mr. Chillingworth) *is of Apostolick institution*: which if once we grant, it will follow, lastly, from the third proposition that I have laid down, that *it ought to be preserved entire in the church in all the ages of it.*

And thus I have freely given you my thoughts,

(and I believe they are much the same in every *true churchman*) touching the *necessity of episcopal government* in the church. I come now to the consequences of this doctrine of which you desire to be informed. And, in my opinion, a *true churchman*, from what has been said concerning the necessity of episcopacy, in conjunction with his other principles, will draw these following inferences.

First, that *wherever episcopal government is settled and established, it ought by no means to be abolished*. If any bishop do assume more power to himself than what justly belongs to him, he may and ought to be restrained by proper authority : but wholly to abolish an order or office so early settled and universally received throughout the Christian church, a *true churchman* cannot but look upon as a dangerous encroachment upon the authority of the Apostles, or rather of Christ himself, from whom they received their commission.

Secondly, *where episcopacy, as above stated, is the government of an established church, against whose communion no just or sufficient objection can be made ; all Christians ought to own the communion of that church as lawful ; and they who live within the precincts, where she is so established, are bound in conscience to join in communion with her : and that notwithstanding that in their opinion she may labour under some defects*. For where a church is established in which we may fully enjoy all the ordinances of God that are necessary to salvation, and are compelled to do nothing that is contrary to

the law of God ; no supposed defect can justify a separation from such a church.

Thirdly, if two societies of Christians, in any place or country, do enjoy the freedom of their religion, both in all other respects equally orthodox ; but the government of the one being episcopal, and the other not so : *a true churchman will think himself obliged to hold communion with such an episcopal church wherever he finds it*, rather than with those who have rejected that Apostolick form of government. Nor is it to him material, in this case, to say that the *non-episcopal* church is established by law, and the *episcopal* only tolerated or connived at. For wherever he has the opportunity of enjoying any ordinance of God, he thinks that no human law ought to debar him from it : and whatever he finds or judges to have been appointed by the Apostles throughout the universal church ; and that in pursuance of that very command and commission which they had received for the preaching of the Gospel, and the performancè of those other things which confessedly are of divine institution, and ordinarily necessary to salvation (which he takes to be plainly the case of episcopacy), he looks upon as the ordinance of God himself. But if this same episcopal church shall wilfully neglect to pray for that civil government, which by the Providence of God, and the laws of the place, is justly set over them, he will openly protest against this defect in their worship ; it being, beyond all dispute, an Apostolick constitution, *that supplications, prayers,*

intercessions, and giving of thanks should be made —for kings and for all that are in authority. 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

Fourthly, wherever episcopacy has been abolished or laid aside; *a true churchman thinks it the duty of every man who professes Christianity, to do what, in his station, he fairly can for the re-establishment of it*: and that because he takes it to be a divine ordinance. But how far the necessities, or invincible prejudices of any of the foreign reformed churches, will excuse them before God, either for the laying aside or not restoring of the episcopal office, he will not take upon him to judge; although, in such cases as these, his charity will always incline him to the most favourable opinion.

But, fifthly, if, by the Providence of God, a *true churchman* should be under a necessity of living in a place, where he cannot have the benefit of communicating with an episcopal church; *there is no principle, that I have here ascribed to him, that will lay him under a necessity of absolutely refusing the communion of a church, that wants nothing but episcopacy to render it truly agreeable to the Apostolick model.* Wherever he finds a defect in a church, he thinks it his duty to endeavour, what in his station he can, the supplying of it: but it is not every *real defect* in a church that can lay a private Christian under an obligation of renouncing, or absolutely refusing her communion. Every man is certainly bound to serve God, both privately and publicly, as near as he can according to what God himself has

prescribed: but if things (where I am) are not ordered, in all respects, exactly according to this rule; and it be no way in my power to remedy it; I think I ought to serve God as well as I can, if I cannot do it as well as I would. What God has *forbid* I must not do; but if it be not in my power to do every thing according as he has *commanded*; I doubt not but he will accept me, if I do the best that in my circumstances I can.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

October 20, 1708.

P O S T S C R I P T.

BECAUSE (upon a careful recollection of our late discourse) I cannot but remember, that you dropped some expressions that seemed to have a tincture not only of *antiepiscopal* but even *antiministerial* principles : although I have already exceeded the bounds of a letter ; yet I shall beg the favour of you a little, with me, to review what I have but just now said touching the *necessity of episcopacy*.

And when you look back upon the three first propositions which I have there laid down, I pray consult the *New Testament* and consider those places, where not only a command is given for the performance of the several parts of the ministerial function ; but also *certain persons* appointed for the discharge of that office ; and that either with plain direction, or a very sufficient intimation that they should take care to appoint others who should go on with the same work, when they themselves should be gone off the stage of this world : for example,

Matth. xxviii. 19, 20. It was to the *eleven disciples*, v. 16. that our Saviour said, *Go teach all nations baptizing them—And lo I am with you always* (that is, with you and your successors in this office) *even to the end of the world*.

John xx. 21. To the same persons (only Thomas being absent, v. 24.) it was that he said, *As my*

Father hath sent me, so send I you, &c. Which plainly implies a power of sending others where they could not go themselves, or when they should be about to leave the world.

And that the Apostles understood this power to be thus given them in order to be continued to succeeding generations, is so plain from their practice that nothing can be more. *For this cause left I thee in Crete* (says St. Paul to Titus, chap. i. 5.) *that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting; and ordain elders in every city.* Again, 2 Tim. ii. 2. *The things that thou hast heard of me—the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also.* And if any man's bare personal qualifications, without any other mission, were a sufficient warrant for him to take upon himself the office of a minister of the Gospel, what could St. Paul mean when he puts the question, as of a thing beyond all manner of doubt, Rom. x. 15. *How shall they preach except they be sent?*

As to the fourth proposition; I wave all dispute about the NAME of *bishop* and *presbyter*, or by what other title they were or might be distinguished. But that the OFFICE, there described by Mr. Chillingworth, was not only exercised by the Apostles themselves, (which I think no man denies), but also by other persons particularly appointed by them for that purpose, is beyond contradiction evident from the instances of Timothy and Titus, and the epistles to them written: nor is it by any means a sufficient reply, to say, that Timothy and Titus

were, in an *extraordinary* manner, appointed by St. Paul to finish that work of settling and establishing the churches of Ephesus and Crete, which he, being called away to other places, could not stay to make an end of; and were not in that capacity, *ordinary officers* to be always continued in the Christian church: for, besides that this is spoken without any manner of proof, and is contrary to the unquestioned opinion of the Christian church for above fifteen hundred years after Christ,* I desire you to tell me: did all those persons, who in the several parts of the church, had upon the like occasions received the same power, from some of the Apostles, as Timothy and Titus had done from St. Paul—did they, I say, all lose this power as soon as the Apostles that employed them were dead; as the death of any prince or potentate makes void the commission of his substitute or ambassador? If they did, then it will follow, that when the churches dispersed throughout the world had most occasion for the exercise of this power (*viz.* when, by the death of the Apostles, they were deprived of their personal care and inspection) they could not have the benefit

* Timothy is called the *First Bishop* of Ephesus, and Titus of Crete, in those inscriptions which are placed at the end of the epistles, written by St. Paul to them: which inscriptions, though not of canonical authority, I take to be of credit sufficient to shew the notion that the ancient church had of their office in those places. Nor is it denied that Eusebius styles them Bishops of those places in the same sense that we now understand the word *Bishop*. *Hist. Eccl.* l. iii. c. 4.

of it ; which seems absurd to imagine. But if the power of Timothy and Titus (as it is described in the epistles to them) did remain the same in them, and others such as they were, after that the Apostles were departed out of this world ; then the *office* of a bishop, as above described, was of Apostolick institution : nor do I think it of any moment to contend about the *name* or title given to them.

As to the fifth proposition : if we duly consider that the office of superintending and governing the churches, every where at first planted, was *chiefly* exercised by the Apostles themselves who planted them ; as appears from the example of St. Paul, who had the *care of all the churches* (that is all of his planting) upon him, 2 Cor. xi. 28. *visiting every city where he had preached the Word of the Lord*, Acts, xv. 36. And though *absent*, yet could and did give *judgment* in cases that required the discipline of the church, 1 Cor. v. 3. If this, I say, be duly considered ; and also that the Holy Scripture is silent as to what was done by almost all the rest of the Apostles, beyond Jerusalem and Judæa, in the propagation of the Gospel : it is not to be wondered that we meet with so little in the *New Testament* touching any others who acted in the capacity of *bishops* (as we now understand that word) as long as the Apostles remained alive. But as the instances of Timothy and Titus do sufficiently prove that some such bishops, as we contend for, were appointed, as occasion required, even in the days of the Apostles themselves : so is it freely owned by the greatest

champions for presbytery that *immediately* after their time, this form of government universally obtained throughout the whole Christian church. And that you may not think yourself imposed upon by this assertion, I shall here transcribe the quotations that Mr. Chillingworth has set down, and add a few others for your farther satisfaction.

Petrus Molinaeus in his book *De Munere Pastoralis*, purposely written in defence of the presbyterial government, acknowledgeth, *that presently after the Apostles' times ; or even in their time (as ecclesiastical story witnesseth) it was ordained, that, in every city one of the presbytery should be called a bishop ; who should have pre-eminence over his colleagues ; to avoid confusion, which oft-times ariseth out of equality : and truly this form of government all churches every where received.*

Theodorus Beza, in his tract, *De triplici Episcopatus genere*, confesseth in effect the same thing. For, having distinguished episcopacy into three kinds, *divine, human and satanical* ; and attributing to the second (which he calls *human*, but we maintain and conceive to be Apostolical) not only a priority of order, but a superiority of power and authority over other presbyters, bounded yet by laws and canons provided against tyranny ; he clearly professeth, that of this kind of episcopacy is to be understood whatsoever we read concerning the authority of bishops (or presidents, as Justin Martyr calls them) in Ignatius and other more ancient writers.

Thus far out of Mr. Chillingworth, whose quota-

tions indeed, having not the books at hand, I have not examined; but yet have no doubt of the exactness of them; not only on the score of his great ability and sincerity, but also because I never could find that he has herein in the least been contradicted.

In the margin of the same discourse I find quoted Dan. Chamier Panstrat. tom. ii. lib. 10. cap. 6. sect. 24. His words are *Inæqualitatem* [sc. *inter episcopos et presbyteros*] *esse vetustissimam, ac vicinam Apostolorum temporibus : quod nos ultro fate-
mur.* He calls this inequality there indeed an *innovation* : but yet owns that in Alexandria, which was the *last* church wherein it took place, it was introduced *aut nondum elapso, aut vix elapso primo seculo.*

I find there also quoted Nic. Vedelius, Exerc. iii. in *Epist. Ignat. ad Philadelph.* cap. 14. et Exerc. viii. in *Epist. ad Mariam*, cap. 3. but have not the book by me. But the former of these quotations I find in Vedelius's words set down by Forbesius Irenic. lib. ii. cap. 11. *Jam, inquit, tempore Ignatii erat discrimen illud presbyterorum et episcopi.*

Hieronymus Zanchius (quoted also by Forbesius) saith thus, *Non ita multo post Apostolos, obtinuit consuetudo, ut ex multis pastoribus, seu presbyteris et episcopis, unus præficeretur reliquis omnibus, non tanquam dominus, sed ut rector reliquis senatoribus; cui imprimis commendata esset cura totius alicujus ecclesia; reliqui illius esset coadjutores et collegæ.—
Ac proinde huic etiam primarii καὶ ἐξάρχον nomen episcopi et pastoris attribuebatur : reliqui collegæ*

presbyterorum tantum nomine contenti fuerunt. Ita factum erit et quæque civitas unum haberet episcopum et multos presbyteros, &c. In Quart. Præcept. Pag. (Forbesio) 732, 733. (Mihi) 666, 667.

Augustinus Marloratus, by the *Angels of the Seven Churches*, Rev. i. 20. understands with the generality of interpreters, the bishops or pastors of those churches. And that you may clearly see what notion he had of those bishops which were appointed in that early age of the church, take his own words (*Exposit. Ecclesiast. in Apoc. cap. ii. v. 1.*) *Non populum aggreditur sed Clerum; nec quemlibet de Clero nominatim compellat, sed Principem Cleri, utique episcopum.* This he speaks without any doubt or hesitation; and his testimony is so much the more to be regarded, because he was well acquainted with, and a diligent collector of the opinions of the learned divines of those foreign reformed churches where the presbyterian government was established.

Monsieur Bochart is indeed of opinion, that the government of the church at first, was according to the presbyterian model: into which mistake it is probable he was led by finding presbyters settled in several churches, before there was any fixed or resident bishop amongst them: the office of superintending and governing the churches every where being, as I have already said, for some time exercised by the several apostles that planted them. But yet observe the free acknowledgement of this learned man in his own words, *Cependant je demeure d'accord que l'Ordre Episcopal est de grande antiquité,*

et qu'il a été reçu avec beaucoup de fruit par toute l'église, bientôt après les Apôtres. Lettre à Monsieur Morley, p. 4.

Were it necessary in so plain a case, I could add many more quotations to the same purpose. But I conclude this point with one out of David Blondel, who was the greatest champion that ever yet appeared against episcopacy. He then (*Præf. ad Apol. pro Sentent. Hieron.*) describes the place and office of the senior presbyter in every church to have been much the same as I have said Mr. Chillingworth ascribes to a bishop, calling them *Presbyterorum Præpositos*, ἐξάρχες, *Cleri totius capita πρωτοκληθέντες*, who had *the first, or chief, care of each church, by the consent of their fellow presbyters*; and telling us, that *the well or ill doing of the flock committed to them, might justly be charged upon them*. As he says it appears by the messages sent to the *angels of the Asiatic churches*, Rev. ii. 3. And having in these and other words described them as persons of a remarkable eminence above the rest of the presbyters; he tells us (on what solid ground I cannot find) that this office of course belonged to the eldest presbyter in every church, upon whose death he says it was, by succession, derived to the next in seniority, and so continued until the year of our Lord 108 (for the case of Timothy and Titus he looks upon to be extraordinary); after which he has these remarkable words: *Sed paulo post—ad Suffragia ubique (velut conspiratione facta) itum, ut deinceps fratrum caput et πρωτος ἦν esset non (pro veteri more)*

ἡ πόλις ἐκπολιτῆς, *sed (ex recenti instituto) inter collegas dotibus ad communem ædificationem potior, &c.* Pag. 6, 7, 8. So that Blondel himself, a professed adversary, grants the *office of a bishop* to have been from the very first establishment of churches; but only alledges (how truly I do not now enquire) that this office at first went by succession; and that soon after the year 108, it came every where to be elective. And to make this scheme of his out, he is forced to have recourse to a very extravagant supposition; namely, that the churches every where, on a sudden, *as if they had conspired together*, made a change in the manner of appointing their bishops or presidents, and brought it from succession to election: although it is very evident that so material a change in a thing of that consequence could not be introduced without great opposition, which therefore must have made it a business of longer time than he supposes.

The sixth and last proposition which I have laid down, touching the *necessity of episcopacy*, is so plain an inference from what went before, that I think it cannot be gainsaid. For that the form of church-polity, settled by the Apostles, should, immediately, after their decease, be universally changed, and that without any opposition given, or so much as notice taken by any writer of that age, or near it, that such a change there was, is a supposition that sure no man that considers thoroughly will ever admit.

From the confession therefore of the most learned

adversaries of episcopacy, our *churchman* gathers enough to conclude, with the established church, that *bishops*, as well as *priests*, or presbyters and *deacons* have been even from the *Apostles' time*. Pref. to the Form of Ordinat.

I pray observe, that St. John lived to the year of Christ 99, or, as some say, two or three years longer. Now if the church, during his life, had innovated in the matter of episcopacy, he certainly would have given public opposition to it: and how so great a change as is pretended could *universally*, and *without opposition*, be introduced within eleven or twelve years after his death, is, to me, a riddle not to be accounted for.

**THE NATURE OF SUPREMACY, IN MAT-
TERS ECCLESIASTICAL, VESTED IN
THE CROWN.**

BY ANTHONY ELLYS, D.D.

BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

AS great weight is laid on the declarations, which the Romanists say, our laws make, that all the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of our bishops flows originally from the crown; it will be necessary to enter into the discussion of this objection more minutely.

The first point to be considered, is the nature of supremacy in matters ecclesiastical, vested in the crown by the act of 1 Eliz. chap. i. Now that the meaning of this act was not, as the Papists affirm, to declare that the king had a right to preach or administer the sacraments, or to ordain, or inflict church censures with spiritual effects, we may be sufficiently assured; because, that statute refers to and revives those acts of Henry VIII. particularly 26 Henry VIII. chap. 1. by which the ancient jurisdictions belonging to the crown were restored and united to it; and the king, having been acknowledged to be supreme head on earth of the church, was invested with full authority to visit, repress, and

reform all errors, heresies, &c. These same words are used in the oath of supremacy appointed by the first of Elizabeth. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose, that this latter act is to be understood, as to the spiritual authority it intended to confer upon the crown, in the same sense with the former, (see Bacon on Governm. part ii. p. 161.) which, indeed, Queen Elizabeth soon after declared in her Admonition, which was referred to and confirmed by an act of parliament. Now Henry the Eighth declared publicly, that he did not pretend, by this act, or by any other way, to have a right to administer the sacraments, &c. or to confer the same right upon others : but, on the contrary, acknowledged, that the bishops and clergy derived these merely spiritual authorities immediately from Christ.* For in the Institution of a Christian Man, published by the especial command of that king, and subscribed by twenty-one bishops, and many of the clergy, it is asserted, (fol. 39.) “ that Christ and his apostles did institute and ordain, in the New Testament, that, besides the civil powers, there should be also continually in the church militant, certain other ministers and officers, who should have special power

* In a commission granted by King Henry the Eighth, to the Bishop of Hereford, he is licensed even to ordain. But no prince ever pretended to convey the spiritual character ; *ergo*, all that can be meant here, is, that the bishop is licensed to exercise this spiritual part derived from Christ, so as that it shall have a temporal effect ; and the persons so ordained shall be acknowledged by the state in quality of priests.

and authority, and commission; under Christ, to preach and teach, to dispense and administer the sacraments, to consecrate the blessed body of Christ, to loose and absolve, to bind and excommunicate, to order and consecrate others in the same room and office." And *ibid.* fol. 50: "We may not think that it doth appertain to the office of kings, but priests, to preach, teach, and administer the sacraments, to absolve, excommunicate, and do such other things belonging to the office and administration of bishops and priests."

And even in the commissions by which some bishops in the reign of Henry the Eighth held their bishopricks of him during pleasure, and had his license to execute their spiritual functions, there is a clause, in which he acknowledges them to have a spiritual authority not derived from the crown but from Christ. *Præter et ultra ea, quæ tibi, ex sacris literis, divinitus, commissa, esse dignoscuntur.**

During the reign of his son Edward the Sixth, in the ordinal then composed for ordaining of bishops, the archbishop says to the bishop, who is to be consecrated, "Will you maintain and set forward, as much as in you shall lie, quietness, and love, and peace among all men, and such as be unquiet and criminous within your diocese correct and punish, according to such authority as you have by God's word, and as to you shall be committed by the ordinance of the realm?" The

* *Apol. for the Clergy*, p. 19. *Lesley's Regale*, 62, 63.

bishop answers, "I will, by the help of God." This office was, in the reign of Edward the Sixth, ratified by act of parliament. It was again expressly confirmed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, as indeed it had been virtually confirmed before by that act in the first year of Queen Elizabeth, which revived Edward the Sixth's book of Common Prayer.

Now Henry the Eighth, in the Institution of a Christian Man, before quoted, (fol. 50.) says, "We
 " must think and believe that God hath made
 " christian kings to be as chief heads and overlook-
 " ers over the said priests and bishops, to cause them
 " to administer their office and power committed
 " unto them purely and sincerely ; and, in case they
 " be negligent in any part thereof, to cause them
 " to supply and repair the same again :" referring
 to which, the Queen to the same effect, though more in general, says, " That her claim is, under
 " God, to have sovereignty and rule over all man-
 " ner of persons born within these her realms and
 " dominions, and countries, of what estate either
 " ecclesiastical or temporal soever they be, so as no
 " foreign power shall or ought to have any superio-
 " rity over them." Accordingly, in the 37th of the
 Thirty-nine articles confirmed and authorised by that Queen in parliament, 13 Eliz. chap. xii. it is said, " We do not give to our princes the minister-
 " ing of God's word or sacraments, but only that
 " prerogative which we see to have been given al-
 " ways to godly princes in the holy scriptures by
 " God himself; that is, that they should rule all

“ estates and degrees committed to their charge by
“ God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal ;
“ and restrain, with the civil sword, the stubborn
“ and evil doers.” From all which passages it is
evident, that the authority attributed then to Queen
Elizabeth, by the oath of supremacy,* was not pro-
perly spiritual in any case ; but only to take care ex-
clusively of any other sovereign or foreign power,
that the clergy of this realm should do their duty by
professing and practising themselves, and teaching
the people true religion ; and, if they failed to do it,
then to animadvert and inflict proper penalties upon
them, *viz.* admonition, suspension, deprivation, &c.

Against this account of the nature of the king's
ecclesiastical supremacy, I am sensible that some
objections may be raised from the expressions used
in several statutes in the time of Henry the Eighth
and Queen Elizabeth, *viz.* from 26 Henry VIII.
chap. i. which says, “ that the king, &c. shall have
full power, from time to time, to visit, reform, cor-
rect and amend all such heresies and enormities,
whatsoever they be, which, by any manner of spi-
ritual authority or jurisdiction, ought to or may
lawfully be reformed, ordered, &c. any usage, cus-
tom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription,
or any thing to the contrary hereof notwithstanding.”
From 37 Henry VIII. chap xvii. in which it is said,

* To this same purpose, an explanation of it was given by
Archbishop Usher before, and by order of, the privy council of
Ireland ; for which explanation he had the thanks of King James
the First. See Parr's *Life of Archbishop Usher*, p. 12,

“ that the arehbishops and bishops, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by, under, and from your royal majesty. § 16. Declaring its intent, that all the usurped and foreign power and authority, temporal and spiritual, may for ever be clearly extinguished, and never to be used or obeyed within this realm or any other of your majesty's dominion or country, may it please your highness, that it may further be enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, spiritual or temporal, shall, at any time after the last day of this session of parliament, use, enjoy, or exercise any manner of power, jurisdiction, superiority, pre-eminence or privilege, spiritual or ecclesiastical, within this realm, or within any other your majesty's dominions or countries that now be, or shall hereafter be; but from henceforth shall be clearly abolished out of this realm, and all other your highness's dominions for ever, any statute, ordinance, custom, constitutions, or any other matter or cause whatsoever to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.” § 17. “ And that also it may likewise please your highness, that it may be established and enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that such jurisdictions, privileges, superiority, and pre-eminence, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority hath heretofore been, or may lawfully be, exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all

manner of errors, heresies, and enormities, shall for ever be united to the imperial crown of this realm."

From the 37 Henry VIII. chap. xvii. § 4. which enacts, "that doctors of the civil law, which shall be made chancellors, vicars general, &c. may lawfully execute and exercise all manner of jurisdiction commonly called ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and all censures and coercions appertaining, or in any wise belonging, unto the same, albeit such person or persons be lay, married or unmarried, &c. which act also, § 1. declares the king to be a layman."*

From the 25 Henry VIII. chap. xix. which enacts, "that in case of appeals to be made from the archbishops' courts, (§ 4.) or from places exempt, (§ 6.) into the king in chancery, a commission shall be directed under the great seal of such persons as shall be named by the king's highness, his heirs or successors; which commissioners shall have full power and authority to hear and definitively determine such appeals, and the causes, and all circumstances concern-

* By the first and second of the canons of 1603, all clergymen are obliged to assent to, and maintain, all laws for the restoring to the crown of this kingdom the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical.—Ibid. Archbishops, bishops, &c. have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by union, and from your royal majesty.—Ibid. Your majesty, to whom, by Holy Scripture, all authority and power is wholly given to hear and determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical, and to correct all vice and sin whatsoever, and to all such persons as your majesty shall appoint thereunto. See how far this act, which was repealed by Philip and Mary, was revived by 1 Elizabeth, chap. 1. § 12.

ing the same : and that such judgment and sentence, as the said commissioners shall make and decree in and upon any such appeal, shall be good and effectual, and also definitive."

From 31 Henry VIII. chap. xii. § 23. which enacts, " that such of the late monasteries, &c. and all churches and chapels to them belonging, which, before the dissolution, &c. were exempted from the visitation, and all other jurisdiction of the ordinary, within whose diocese they were situate, shall from henceforth be within the jurisdiction and visitation of such person or persons as by the king's highness shall be limited or appointed." In consequence of which statute, laymen, in many places, became entitled to episcopal jurisdiction by grants from the crown.

From 5 Edward VI. chap. iv. which enacts, § 2. " That if any person or persons shall smite or lay violent hands upon any other, either in any church or church-yard, that then, *ipso facto*, every person so offending shall be deemed excommunicate, and be excluded from the fellowship and company of Christ's congregation." See Dyer, 275. Croke, Eliz. 224, 219.

And from 3 James I. chap. v. § 11. which enacts, " That every Popish recusant convict shall stand and be reputed, to all intents and purposes, disabled, as a person lawfully and duly excommunicated according to the laws of this realm, until ——— and that every person, sued by such person so disabled,

may plead the same in disabling of such plaintiff, as if he or she were excommunicated by sentence in this ecclesiastical court."

These statutes the Romanists are vehement in urging against us, as importing that all kind of spiritual or ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction are united to the crown of these realms.

And the Romanists are not the only objectors in this point. We have persons in England who profess to be Protestants, and very zealous ones, who yet agree with the Church of Rome, in alledging that these statutes fully prove the crown to be entitled, by law, to all kind of ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction.

But these Protestant objectors would do well to consider, whether our laws, if taken in this sense which they contend for, may not be found to affirm things false in themselves, and to vest powers in the crown repugnant to the institutions of the Christian religion. If this should appear to be the case, the civil sanction of these laws would not be sufficient to vindicate them. They will, notwithstanding that sanction, lie equally open to the objections of the Romanists, and be condemned even by many serious Protestants, who, upon their account, may become disaffected to our whole establishment, and be liable to be drawn off from it by the Romanists; who indeed, upon that view chiefly, are so earnest in fixing this sense upon these laws. Every one, therefore, who is a true friend to our constitution, before he agrees with the Romanists in fixing this

sense upon them, ought seriously to consider the consequences of it; *viz.* whether our laws, if understood in this sense, will not affirm things false and wrong; and, if this will be the consequence, he ought from thence to be put upon considering, whether this be the necessary sense of them or not; or whether they may not fairly bear a different one. Not that one ought from these considerations to put a forced or unnatural sense upon the expressions in our laws; for that would neither take off the objections of the Romanists, nor serve to any other good purpose: but these considerations may be of some weight, *à priori*, if the expressions of our laws be doubtful, to induce us to think it probable, that the legislature could not mean them in such a sense; because it is not supposable that they should have been mistaken in such important matters; and much less is it supposable that they would, knowingly, pretend to vest such powers in the crown, as they were sensible Jesus Christ had granted to his clergy only.

Whether these considerations have occurred to our Protestant objectors I do not know: but that they may have a proper weight with you, added to those which have been above-mentioned, in order to make you form a right judgment of the sense of our laws in this point, I must desire you to recollect what has been said in the first section of these papers, about liberty of profession and practice in matters of religion. I have there shewn, that every religious society, whose doctrine and practice are alto-

gether inoffensive to the civil state, and which hath no establishment for it, hath a right to be exempted from any interposals of the civil governor, with regard to its doctrine, worship, or ecclesiastic government.

From whence it follows, that if the civil government in England has any such right of interposing, as our Protestant objectors suppose, in regulating the government and discipline, &c. of our church, it must be derived from the consent and concessions supposed to have been made by our church to the state, on account of the temporal advantages she enjoys from it.

And there is reason, indeed, to suppose that the church has made divers such concessions.

She has consented, that the king's judges should send writs of prohibition to stop the exercise of her discipline in many cases, and mandates to absolve persons excommunicated in others; and that they should be appealed to from her sentences.

She has consented that our kings should exempt some persons and places from her jurisdiction.

That they nominate persons to be chosen bishops, and order their consecration: and that they and others of the laity should present persons to many spiritual cures.

That her bishops and clergy should not at any time meet or make any canons without the king's licence, and subsequent confirmation.

In these, and perhaps in some other points, the

church of this nation has made concessions to the civil government.

And it might lawfully do so, for as long a time as the civil governors should make a right use of these concessions; *viz.* to the benefit of the state without hurting religion or the church. For that this they may do is evident: for instance, they may not use the power of issuing prohibitions to stop the exercise of the church's discipline, nor require any persons to be absolved in any cases, but when it is expedient so to do. They may not exempt any places from episcopal jurisdiction, but for weighty reasons; and in such cases it may be lawful for the church to forbear, for a time, the exercise of her discipline and jurisdiction; for though she has it by divine right, yet she is not obliged to exercise it at all times. It may sometimes be expedient to forbear the exercise of it, in view to obtain greater advantages to religion by forbearing it.

In like manner, though the church has a right to nominate her own officers, as bishops, &c. yet as the civil government may also nominate fit persons for those trusts, the church may lawfully consent to receive them upon the state's nomination, as long as they nominate persons against whom there lies no important objection.

Again, though the church has a right to make any proper regulations concerning her own spiritual affairs, inoffensive to the civil state, yet, as the making such regulations is not at all times necessary,

the church may consent that her clergy shall not meet, nor make any canons without the licence of the civil governor, nor that any of them shall be valid without his subsequent confirmation; for, as the making canons is not at all times necessary, it may at some times be forborn for a considerable space of time, or subjected to the will of the civil governor, upon supposition that he will suffer it to be done when it is really expedient for the church.

As the giving up their power to the civil governor may be very expedient to the state, in order to its preserving a proper influence on the people, and hindering any undue practices from the clergy, if they should at any time be factious and seditious to its disadvantage; so, on the other hand, there may be a real and great expediency to the church, that they should be given up, in order to gain or preserve the continuance of that protection and favour, and support those revenues, dignities, temporal powers, and other emoluments, which the church receives from the state, and which may be made very conducive to the maintenance and promotion of true religion. Upon this common expediency, I say, to the church, as well as to the civil government, the church may be lawfully warranted to make these concessions. But these ought not to be, as they often are, used as arguments of the civil state's having naturally and originally a right in church matters; because, as I have shewn, the state's right in these points is not original, but derived only from

the concessions of the church : and farther, because there are some points in which the church neither has, nor can lawfully make, such concessions to the state.

One of these points is, the right of administering the sacraments in the congregations of Christians. That, the thirty-seventh article says, we give not to our princes. This Jesus Christ hath ordained to be done by persons selected and solemnly set apart to that function ; the doing it is appropriated to that sacred character, and cannot be committed to any that are not vested with it.

Another of these rights, incommunicable to the civil governors or to any mere layman, is, the right of ordaining or consecrating persons to these sacred functions. This right our Lord first exercised himself in the choice of his apostles ; and committed the same to them, with a command that they should appoint and ordain others, as these should still others, and so on in perpetual succession. As in the Jewish law the priesthood was to descend by generation, and no one was to take that office who was not so entitled to it ; so, in the Christian religion, the like sacred function was to be conveyed by imposition of hands, by persons who had received that same imposition from others, and so on till it came at last from the apostles and our Saviour himself. This imposition of hands no one therefore can lawfully give, who has not received it ; and therefore no civil governor, as a layman, can have this right

to ordain others,* unless he has himself received imposition of hands from a qualified person : and in that case he ceases to be a layman. I here speak of ordinary cases, where such imposition of hands from qualified persons is possible to be had. If it be not possible, then how far God may dispense with the want of it, is a different point : but, where it can be had, there is reason to think, that God having made this ordinance, will insist upon it, and so will not suffer laymen to be vested with this right.

A third point not possible to be communicated to laymen, is the authority to inflict ecclesiastical censures with spiritual effects. Jesus Christ having instituted his church as a society distinct from the state, and required that certain conditions should be performed, in order to men's being admitted and continuing members of it, and having instituted governors to see that these conditions be performed, he has accordingly vested them with a power of

* The 36th article in effect acknowledges this, when it saith that the book of consecration of archbishops, &c. doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering, &c. The Queen's Injunctions, referred to by the 37th article, and that article itself, deny that the kings or queens of this realm may challenge authority or power of ministry of divine service in the church. Now, if they have not a right to minister themselves, can they have a right to ordain or qualify others to minister ? *Nemo dat quod non habet*. What is the reason why they cannot minister themselves ? Is it not because they have not been ordained to it ? If that be the reason, the same will hold why they should not ordain others. See Apology for the Clergy, p. 15, 16.

ejecting those persons out of the society who do not perform the conditions required. This power was necessary to the maintenance of order and purity in the society ; and therefore was conferred upon the governors of it : and, in order to give a weight to their censures, Christ has declared, that whatsoever is bound by them on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever shall be loosed on earth shall be loosed in heaven ; the meaning of which is, that when the governors of the society duly eject persons out of it, their censures shall be ratified in heaven ; and the persons offending shall not be restored to the spiritual communion with Christ,* even though he repent, unless he also offers due satisfaction to

* That excommunication justly inflicted hath spiritual effects our law allows ; for article 33 says, “ That that person which, by
“ open denunciation, is rightly cut off from the unity of the
“ church, and excommunicate, ought to be taken of the whole
“ multitude of the faithful as a heathen and a publican, until he
“ be openly reconciled by penance, and be received into the
“ church by a judge that hath authority thereunto.” And see the passage of Lord Coke’s 12th Report, p. 79, concerning the difference between the civil and ecclesiastical judges, where he says, that corruption in the said spiritual and ecclesiastical courts is more dangerous than in the officers in the temporal court : for the temporal judge commits the party convict to the gaoler, but the spiritual judge commits the person excommunicate to the devil.

Before the Reformation, the legislature upon several occasions, required the archbishops and bishops to excommunicate persons ; viz. those who should violate Magna Charta, p. 527 of Coke’s 2d Inst. and *ibid.* p. 536. See also Cotton’s Abridgment, Index, *voc.* *Excom.*

the church. But that if he does repent, and also makes or offers due satisfaction to the church, so as to be absolved by it, then he shall certainly be absolved in heaven.

Now this right or power, which was given to the governors of the church, as necessary for the preservation of order and purity in it, cannot, by them, be alienated or made over to civil governors; because they have no warrant in the Scripture to do it, and it is in the nature of the thing incongruous so to do. For what reason could there be to suppose, that God should permit any spiritual effects to attend the exercise of this power by civil magistrates, to whom he has not given it, nor warranted others to transfer it? Having been designed only to secure the purity and order of the religious society, it cannot warrantably be exercised by any but by the governors of it.

These, which are powers plainly incommunicable to princes or any other laymen, shew that all spiritual power and jurisdiction is not derived from them.

Our princes and our laws themselves acknowledge it. The office of ordination, 37th article, and Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions, referred to and confirmed by parliament.

Accordingly, they have never pretended to assume to themselves, or commit to any layman, the administration of the sacraments, or the ordination of pastors. And Lord Coke acknowledges, that, if they should nominate lay-commissioners to exercise eccle-

siastical censures, the nomination would be wrong or faulty.

Thus the reason of the thing, the declarations of some of our laws, and those of the latest upon this subject, and common practice, agree in shewing that all ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction is not derived from the crown, or united to it.

And from hence we may justly conclude, that it could not be the intention of our legislators, in the acts of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, above-mentioned, upon which the Romanists and others ground their objections; it could not, I say, be the intention of those acts, that all ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction is united to the crown, and derived solely from thence.

But what other sense can be put upon them, you will say, without a force upon the words? Does not 26 Henry VIII. ch. i. say, that the king, &c. shall have full power to visit and correct all such heresies, &c. as by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought, or may lawfully be reformed? I answer, Yes: he may correct all such, by an external, political, coercive power, which, no doubt, he has in him.

But does not 37 Henry VIII. chap. xvii. affirm, that archbishops and bishops, &c. have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by, under, and from his royal majesty? Yes*, and it is true they

* But then a later law, as I have above observed, does expressly allow, that they have some power to censure and punish.

have none of this external and coercive jurisdiction, with temporal effects, but by and from his majesty's permission. And that, indeed, is all which the law considers as being properly jurisdiction ; for though, indeed, the law does suppose, as I have above shewn from the ordinal for consecrating bishops, that they, the bishops, have some power derived from Christ for correction of others ; yet the spiritual effects of that power not being visible nor cognizable by the temporal judges, they therefore never took any cognizance of them, but only of the temporal and visible effects of the bishop's power : this they only meant by lawful or legal jurisdiction † though even

by God's word : and the law ought not to be supposed to contradict itself ; and therefore this act in Henry the Eighth must necessarily be understood only of external coercive jurisdiction ; and it is true that the bishops, &c. have none of this, &c.

† Jurisdiction properly signifies an authority to take cognizance of, and determine in a public and judicial way, and with legal forms and effects, any controversies or causes that are litigated, and to censure or acquit any persons according to laws before made concerning those matters.

Now, though the bishops and clergy have originally in themselves derived from Christ an authority to judge in church matters, and of persons as concerned in them ; yet, since the establishment of Christianity in this realm, and, as long as that lasts, they have no right to exercise this authority in a judicial way, in this realm, but from the king ; because, by the supposed convention between the church and civil government, by which the exercise of this spiritual authority is attended with temporal penalties and effects, which of itself it had not ; it was agreed, that this spiritual authority should not be exercised in a public judicial way, but by the king's permission or consent, and with such

the bishop's jurisdiction, attended with spiritual effects, they might consider as being also derived from the crown, in regard that the crown permitted the exercise of it.

The same sense may be justly put upon 1 Eliz. chap. i. sect. 17. which asserts, that such jurisdictions, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority hath heretofore been, or may lawfully be, exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state or persons, or for the reformation of all manner of heresies, &c. shall be for ever united to the imperial crown of this realm.

The ecclesiastical authority formerly used for the correction of ecclesiastical and other persons, of which the law took cognizance, was, as I said, only the external and coercive authority attended with temporal effects. Of the spiritual effects, though they at the same time supposed there might be such,

limitation as he or the law should put upon it : and, in regard to this state of things, it may be properly enough said, that the bishops, &c. have no spiritual jurisdiction that is attended with legal effects, nor any that can be exercised here, but by and from the king's permission. And this is what our laws mean.

This was plainly the sense of our judges, and of the legislators themselves before the Reformation : they allowed that the bishops and the Pope too, had a spiritual authority in several cases : this is plain from the notion of the whole church at that time ; but not that they should exercise this authority here, but with certain circumstances. And, if they did at any time exercise it otherwise, they regarded the exercise of it as null. This appears from several cases in the year books.

yet they would not take any notice, nor consider them at all; not even in the times when popery prevailed here. This appears from divers cases in the year books, and particularly from the following remarkable one: there had been an appeal made to the Pope in some cause litigated between the subjects of this realm, and of ecclesiastical cognizance. The Pope, having tried the cause, awarded costs to one of the parties, and sent a commission of delegacy to the Archbishop of Canterbury to cause them to be levied. The archbishop, upon the refusal of the party who was to pay them, excommunicated him for contumacy: the law, in those times, did, no question, admit that the archbishop's sentence of excommunication, when just, would be attended with spiritual effects; but whether it was so or not, or whether it was just or not in that case, the judges would not examine. It was a maxim in law, that the Pope's excommunications, whatever spiritual effects they might have, were not to be at all regarded by our law, nor suffered to have any temporal effects here; that is, he was not allowed to have any ecclesiastical jurisdiction in this realm; and though the archbishop, in other cases, had such spiritual jurisdiction by law, yet, in this case, as he acted in pursuance of the Pope's commission and sentence, the judges would not allow even him to have any legal ecclesiastical jurisdiction.* What effects his

* They would not allow an excommunication by any of our own bishops to be of force, but against persons within his own

and the Pope's sentence might have *in foro spirituali*, the judges would not consider: but visible, legal, and temporal effects, they would not allow them to have any in this realm. This was the notion which the law had of spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction long before the Reformation. And all ecclesiastical or spiritual power and jurisdiction, in this sense, is truly said to be united to the crown; and, indeed, to have always been in it. Which consideration made Lord Coke, and others of our chief lawyers, affirm, that this† (1 Eliz. chap. i.) was only a declarative law reviving and restoring the ancient ecclesiastical authority of the crown, and not adding any new authority to it. And this undoubtedly is true, if the act be understood in the sense I here put upon it, as asserting only an external coercive jurisdiction in ecclesiastical causes to belong to the crown: for such a one was always affirmed and acknowledged to belong to it, even before the Reformation. But if this were to be understood to affirm, that all that internal spiritual authority, which Christ gave to his apostles and their successors, in every ecclesiastical matter, was inherent in, and could be justly exercised by, the crown or its

diocese: nor even in his own diocese, unless, in his certificate of it to the temporal courts, he specified the particular cause of it, that they might know whether it was legal or not.

† The act of 1 Eliz. chap. i. is intituled, An act to restore to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the estate, ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same.

delegates ; it is most certain, that this was not the notion of any of our judges or legislators before the Reformation. Our laws did then most evidently suppose and assert the contrary. Since, therefore, this act is allowed to be only declarative of the ancient spiritual authority and jurisdiction of the crown, and not to vest in it any new powers ; it follows, that it must be taken in the sense I have here put upon it, as asserting only an external, coercive, political authority in spiritual things, and over spiritual persons : and this authority may very truly and consistently with the institutions of the gospel, and with the spiritual authority from thence derived to the clergy, be allowed to our princes ; so that, in this sense, there is no just cause for the Romanists to object against the supremacy in ecclesiastical matters vested by our laws in the crown of this realm.

Nor had those prelates in the first year of Queen Elizabeth, to whom the oath of supremacy was offered, any just cause to refuse it. That oath asserted only, “ that the Queen’s highness was the
“ only supreme governor of this realm, and all
“ other her highness’s dominions and countries, as
“ well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or
“ causes, as temporal ; and that no foreign prince,
“ person, prelate, state, or potentate hath or ought
“ to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-
“ eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual,
“ within this realm : and, therefore, I do utterly

“ renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions,
“ powers, superiorities, and authorities, and do pro-
“ mise that from henceforth, I shall bear faith and
“ true allegiance to the Queen’s highness, her heirs
“ and lawful successors, and, to my power, shall
“ assist and defend all jurisdictions, privileges, pre-
“ eminences and authorities granted or belonging to
“ the Queen’s highness, her heirs and successors, or
“ united and annexed to the imperial crown of this
“ realm. So help me God, &c.”

By the Queen’s being the only supreme governor of this realm, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as well as temporal, might very fairly be meant only such a directive, coercive, political power in all ecclesiastical causes, as has been before asserted. And if the prelates of that time had rightly considered it, with all the other declarations that had been made upon this subject, they might have easily seen, that no more was intended than this.

Indeed, there was reason to believe they were satisfied that no more was intended, because many of them had taken an oath of the like nature, full as strong as this, in the time of King Henry the Eighth, required by 25 Henry VIII. chap. i. by which they renounced all the Pope’s jurisdiction here, and swore to acknowledge the King as supreme head on earth of the church of England; and to maintain and defend all the acts or statutes made, or to be made, in confirmation and corroboration of his majesty’s power and supremacy on earth of the

church of England; so that they could not well have any real scruples now about this oath to Queen Elizabeth.

But whether they had any such scruple or not, as they had no real cause for refusing the oath, which was designed for a just security to the government, they might, with reason, be supposed to be persons disaffected to it, and might, therefore, be justly deprived of the ecclesiastical benefits and dignities they possessed.

But the Romanists object farther, that this deprivation of the bishops, in the first year of Queen Elizabeth, was unjust in another respect, *viz.* because it was effected by the lay power only, which has no right to eject bishops out of their sees. As they are consecrated to them by a spiritual authority derived from Christ, nothing less than the like authority can take away the right which they have to them, or dissolve the spiritual obligations, which the people committed to their charge are under to obey them. The act of the temporal legislature, therefore, by which only they were deprived of their bishopricks, was a sacrilegious violation of the rights of the church; and consequently their successors were schismatical and unjust intruders into those sees; and, consequently, the succession of our present bishops, derived from them, is unjust, irregular, and schismatical.

In answer to this objection, we affirm, that, whenever any bishops are really disaffected to the civil state, or otherwise notoriously unworthy of their

sacred charge, and their fellow bishops will not censure and deprive them, they may then be justly and effectually censured or deprived of their sees by the civil power alone.

This authority to censure and deprive the bishops and clergy, when there is just occasion for it, belongs to the civil sovereigns of every state, on account of their being trustees and guardians of the public welfare, to the maintenance of which this authority is necessary. For, if the civil sovereign had it not, the clergy might, in some cases, be not only corrupt and heretical to a great degree themselves, and so the people might be infected by their example and instruction, but they might have so great an influence upon the people, as might affect or endanger the subversion of the civil government. They might raise or foment such notions or prejudices among them, as might, either directly or indirectly, make them disaffected to the government, and as disposed as they might be able to raise successful seditions and rebellions against it. If you think this not to be practicable, do but consider what has been actually done in divers instances.

First, the authority of the Greek emperors in Rome, and a great part of Italy, was in a very short time almost wholly subverted by the artful management of the bishops and clergy of Rome, and their influence upon the people, in the dispute concerning image worship. The Emperor Leo Isaurus having thought fit to interpose to prevent the worship of images, which was grown excessive and

highly scandalous to the Christian religion, the people of Italy, who were much inclined to that worship, were so artfully applied to by the Pope of Rome, and their zeal for the images, and against the profaneness of the emperor, as it was represented, was so much inflamed, that they very soon raised a sedition against his authority, pulled down his images, denied his tributes, and, in a little time, by the help of the Franks, entirely threw off all subjection to him.

How far the superstition of the people, and their attachment to the clergy may go, and consequently how able the clergy may be to distress the civil government, we have another remarkable instance in the case of Robert, King of France, the son of Hugh Capet. This prince was of a good moral character; he, by the advice of an assembly of the bishops of France, espoused Bertha; who being *sa parente au quatrième degré*, the canon law did not allow him to marry her without a dispensation from the Pope. Pope Gregory the Fifth being incensed because he made no application to him for that purpose, threatened to excommunicate the king and Bertha, if he did not separate from her, and actually put the whole kingdom of France under an interdict, A. D. 1003. “A quoi les peuples déférèrent
“ si humblement (says Mezeray, Abr. vol. i. p. 313.
“ See also Droit Eccl. Franc. tom. i. p. 219.) que
“ tous les domestiques du Roi, à la réserve de deux
“ ou trois, l’abandonnèrent, et on jettoit aux chiens
“ tout ce qu’on desservoit de devant lui, personne

“ ne voulant manger de viandes qu’il avoit touchées.
 “ Ces rigueurs le contraignèrent de se séparer
 “ d’avec elle. Mais ce ne fut que deux ou trois ans
 “ après. Et on trouve qu’ils firent le voyage de
 “ Rome, soit pour y défendre leur cause devant le
 “ Pape, soit pour lui demander pardon. Tant y a
 “ que le mariage demeura nul.” It is evident,
 that, if there had been other fit circumstances, the
 superstition of the people might have been easily
 wrought upon to dethrone this prince.

In Germany, about the year 1076, the emperor
 Henry IV. was excommunicated by Pope Gregory
 VII. upon the quarrel between them, concerning
 the right of giving investitures to bishops. “ Pon-
 “ tificex Augustum diris devovit, populum sacra-
 “ menti et obsequii vinculo solvit. Ejusmodi ful-
 “ minis pontificii eâ tempestate tanta vis fuit, ut et
 “ apud plerosque omnes (says Puffendorf, Introd.
 “ Hist. of Europe, p. 423.) Imperatoria majestas
 “ evilesceret, et ipse Augustus in summas calamita-
 “ tates et ærumnas conjiceretur. Indicto A. D.
 “ 1076, omnium pene principum conventu Treberæ,
 “ imperium Henrico abrogatur. Sententia tamen
 “ postea mitigata est, ut ad arbitrium pontificis tota
 “ causa referatur. Inter hæc Henricus paucis co-
 “ mitibus, adultâ jam hieme, in Italiam profectus,
 “ Canusii ad portam sub dio, vulgari et laneo habitu
 “ nudisque pedibus per triduum substitit, veniam
 “ supplex a pontifice petens.” And even after this
 base submission, the Pope did not cease to excite so
 great troubles and rebellions against him, that in the

end this unhappy prince lost his life. In like manner, his successor Henry V. was so distressed by the Pope about the affair of investitures, that he was forced to give them up, A. D. 1122. “*Quo facto*
“ *et imperatoria majestas vehementer est imminuta,*
“ *et pontificia auctoritas et potentia mirifice aucta.*”
Puffend. Introd. p. 423-425.

In England King Edwy, about A. D. 958, having incurred the ill-will of the monks, who were then very popular in this nation, with Dunstan, then Abbot of Glastenbury, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, at their head; the monks “*firent tous*
“ *les efforts possibles pour décrier la conduite du*
“ *jeune roi. Par les calòmniees de tous totez qu'ils*
“ *semèrent contre lui, ils réussirent enfin à le faire*
“ *passer dans l'esprit de leurs dévots pour le plus*
“ *impié des hommes. Ces calomnies répandus avec*
“ *soin firent un si prompt effet, qu'on vit bientôt*
“ *paroître dans la Mercie un grand nombre des mé-*
“ *contents, dont Edgar frère du roi se déclarer le*
“ *chef et protecteur, &c.*” Rapin, tom. i. The consequence was, that Edwy was outed of a great part of his dominions.

After the Conquest, King Stephen was in great danger of the like fate. As he gained the kingdom by the influence of the Pope and clergy, to the exclusion of the Empress Maud, who had the true right; so when he had once disobliged them in taking away their castles, he found how great and dangerous their influence was against him. In a synod they formally declared him to be deposed,

and, if the Empress Maud had managed politicly, that king could never have kept the throne.

These instances, to which many others might be added, shew plainly, that, at some times, religion or superstition may have so much power upon the minds of mankind, that the clergy, who can work upon them thereby, may, if suffered to keep their influence, and the power which their sacred character and revenues give them, be very dangerous to the civil government. They may, in many cases, even prevail against it.

And this is true, not only of the clergy of the Romish communion with the Pope at their head, but it may likewise be true in many cases of the Protestant clergy. You must see this, if you consider what happened in Scotland in King James the First's time, before he came to the crown of England,* and the influence which even of late Dr. Sacheverel had on the people of England, and if at the same time you attend to the scheme of ecclesiastical authority independent of the civil state, which some of them contend for, and in several cases have actually usurped, *viz.*

That the bishops only should elect, as well as ordain, all bishops and clergy, and alone have authority to judge and censure them in all matters, either of faith or practice, unless in capital crimes, and other great ones of a secular nature :

* See Spotswood's Church History of Scotland, and Heylin's History of the Presbyterians.

That the bishops should have the sole administration and disposal of all church revenues, not indeed to alienate them, but to distribute them as they think fit, and not to let them be alienated by the civil government :

That they should have an entire liberty to preach, and cause their clergy to preach what doctrine they please to the people :

That they should have a right to censure all the laity, even by the excluding from communion, as long as they please, the members of parliament, peers, the royal family, and the king himself :

That they should have a right to hear secret confessions of all their sins, and to give them absolution :

That they should have a liberty to meet together in convocation so often as they think fit, and treat upon ecclesiastical matters, censure opinions, and the like :

These independent powers, in the hands of cunning and ambitious men, and in times when the people are inclined to superstition, might they not easily make the clergy, Protestant as well as others, too hard for a civil government ?

Lesley indeed (*Regale et Pontificate*) proposes, that they should be under the obligation of oaths, not to use their influence against the civil government : that the principle of passive obedience to it should be propagated among them : and that the civil governors, though they should not have authority to deprive the bishops, yet should be at liberty to imprison, or put them to death, if they were found to

act or design treason or sedition against the government. But first, how weak a security would oaths or principles be, when the clergy might be ill designing and ambitious? How little would it signify, that the civil government might imprison them, or put them to death? They might have good reason to be assured of their disaffection and seditious practices, and yet might not have evidence sufficient to convict them. If you say that they ought not to be deprived without sufficient evidence, and that where that is, they may be imprisoned or put to death, which will hinder their influence more effectually than depriving them; I answer, that may be true in some cases: but, in the mean time, the nation and the civil government may, and must, suffer for want of bishops to exercise their functions; which, if these criminal ones be deprived instead of imprisoned, may be done by other fit persons appointed to succeed them in those posts for the public service.

Upon the whole, an authority to deprive the bishops and clergy, who are found to use their influence against the civil government, is the best, it is the only effectual security which that government can have in general, and in all cases that may happen. Now our Saviour certainly designed, that civil governments, which are necessary to the welfare of mankind, should be secured in all cases; and therefore he could not design that his clergy should be so far independent of it, as the powers above specified would make them. He must allow, that the civil governors must have a right to limit and controul the

exercise of the clergy's spiritual jurisdiction, when it may be otherwise exercised, so as it may do harm to the state. He must have vested the civil governors with a right not only to judge of the conduct and design of the bishops and clergy, but even to deprive them of their secular emoluments, and to restrain the exercise of their sacred functions, when it is found that the civil government will really be endangered or suffer much by their continuing to exercise them. And their having a right to remove, or deprive, the bishops and clergy, when they are really disloyal and dangerous to the state, infers, that they must have a right to take cognizance and judge of their doctrine and conduct in all cases.* For if they had not this right to judge in all cases, then, in some of the excepted cases, the welfare of the civil society might be endangered, which is not to be admitted.

However, it does not follow from their right of judging, that they must have a right to act against the clergy in all cases; for the civil government may

* The necessity of providing for the safety of the civil government infers, that all princes have a right to deprive bishops and clergymen, who are found to be seditious, and disaffected to the civil state, and in a condition to hurt it. But Christian princes, who have established this religion, have a farther right, in virtue of this establishment, to censure and deprive bishops only for erroneous doctrine; even though these principles, or conduct, should not be hurtful to the civil state. For as they protect and maintain the bishops, &c. to teach their people true doctrine, so they have, in themselves, a right to judge which is true doctrine; and if the bishops, &c. will not teach that doctrine, then to deprive them of the benefits of the establishment.

judge wrong, and, whenever they do so, they cannot have any right to act in pursuance of such judgments ; if they do so, they will be called to a severe account by God for such a misuse of their power. And therefore they ought to be very cautious both how they act and how they judge. In all doubtful cases in christian countries, the civil governors ought to pay a due regard to the advice, and, I will even say, to the authority of the clergy ; for the clergy have some real authority in spiritual matters, which, as I have above observed, ought not to be lightly or disrespectfully opposed. But as the civil governors have a right to judge for themselves in all cases, so when they judge truly that the influence of the bishops and clergy is, or will be, used to the hurt of the civil government, they then have a right to oppose and restrain that influence by proper means, and in a sufficient degree.

To this it may be objected, that, as the civil governors will probably oftener err in their judgment than the clergy will, and so truth will be oftener hindered than promoted thereby, we therefore conceive that Christ cannot have vested the civil governors with this right of judging and censuring the clergy.

But to this I answer, that, even admitting this supposition, which is giving the utmost advantage to the objection, yet still it is justly presumable, that Christ hath vested the civil magistrates with this right ; because their opposition to the truth cannot essentially hurt it. It may both subsist in all cases,

and even thrive under discouragements from them ; whereas, on the other hand, if civil governors had not this right of judging and censuring their government, it could not subsist in some cases. But it is necessary that this should subsist and be secured in all cases: *ergo*, the civil magistrate hath this right, &c.

Now, upon these grounds, we may fully vindicate the deprivation of the bishops made in the first year of Queen Elizabeth, and other proceedings in the Reformation, from whence our settlement ecclesiastical at this day is derived. That princess, at her accession to the throne, found the doctrines, forms of worship, &c. then publicly established, to be very erroneous and superstitious. Almost all the bishops who then were in the several sees, not only professed and practised according to these forms, but they resolved to adhere to them, and refused to take that oath acknowledging the Queen's supremacy, which, I have shewn, was just in itself, and therefore might justly be required of them. They had plainly an aversion to the Queen, on account of her being of a different religion ; and, for that reason, they refused to crown her. A majority of them being of this opinion, they would not, therefore, in an ecclesiastical way have deprived, or acted at all against any of their own number : and if, with these dispositions, they had continued possessed of their sees, they must have been able to do a great deal of mischief to the civil government, both in keeping up error and superstition among the people.

and in raising a disaffection in them towards the civil government, which might have proved very dangerous to its welfare. Therefore, the legislature had a full right to deprive them of their sees. We do not say that the civil government had a right to deprive them of their episcopal character; as they received that from a spiritual authority; and during their lives, no civil power could take it away and the less, because it was not necessary to the safety of the civil government that they should do so. But of the power and right of exercising their episcopal authority in such a diocese, with temporal effects, and of all the secular emoluments, revenues, and dignities thereto belonging, the civil governors, for the sake of the public welfare, had a full right to deprive them.

Upon the voidance of their sees, the deans and chapters belonging to each of them, having a license from the Queen to choose new bishops for their respective churches, chose certain persons by her appointed in letters missive for that purpose. It is true, they were not at liberty to do otherwise; because, if they had not complied with the royal nomination, they would have incurred a perpetual imprisonment, the forfeiture of their goods, &c. i. e. the penalties of a *premunire*. But their being under some constraint in this case was of no real disservice to the church; for, as long as the persons nominated by the Queen were, in all respects, fit for that sacred trust, and she had a right to nominate, it could be no harm that they were obliged to choose persons,

who, by being approved by the Queen, might be the more able to serve the church and religion.

It had, indeed, been the usual practice in this nation, so long ago as the Saxon times, for the kings or their curias to nominate to bishopricks, without any such form as election by the deans and chapters.* Collier, indeed, in his preface to his Ecclesiastical History, vol. 1. p. v. affirms the contrary; and *ibid.* vol. i. p. 114, says, that Withred, king of Kent, in a council at Becanceld, A. D. 694, declares, “that the kings had no right to the appointment of bishops, but that it was to be made by their fellow bishops.” But the authority of this council, though allowed by Dr. Atterbury, Rights of Convoc. and by Bishop Stillingfleet’s Eccles. Cases, vol. ii. p. 89, is opposed by Dr. Wake, in his State of the Church, p. 140; and is not indeed, very clear, so that there cannot be much stress laid upon it. But as to the matter of fact, Ingulphus’s testimony is unquestionable. And our common lawyers generally agree (see Gibson’s Codex, p. 122.) that bishoprics in England,† being at first all of the

* See Stillingfleet’s Ecclesiastical Cases, vol. ii. p. 91. Ingulphus, History, fol. 509, b. says, speaking of the times before the Roman conquest, that, “a multis retro annis nulla erat electio prælatorum mere libera et canonica; sed omnes dignitates, tam episcoporum quam abbatum, regis curia pro sua complacentiâ conferebat.”

† See Selden, Not. ad Eadmer. p. 1608—1610, worth reading. Twissen, Hist. Vindic. of the Church of England, p. 52—64. *ibid.* 109. Coke upon Littleton, § 201, &c.

king's foundation, were donative ; as they were likewise in France,* Spain, and Germany, in those ages, which continued without any considerable opposition, till the see of Rome having formed the project of its own excessive aggrandisement, by bringing all the clergy in Christendom to a more close dependance upon it, Pope Gregory VII. first opposed this practice with vigour ; and his successors, after many struggles, at length, in great measure, carried their point in this, as well as in other kingdoms in Europe. Henry the First yielded up the point of Investitures (see Spelman, in Wilkins's Laws, Life of Henry I. p. 299, 304.) which grant was more solemnly confirmed by King John in the great charter. Then, for a while, elections were made by the deans and chapters, which was the method the church of Rome insisted upon, without any express or peremptory nomination from the crown ; but this method did not continue long. Our kings found it so expedient to the welfare of their civil government, that they should have some influence in the elections of bishops, that they seldom suffered any one to be chosen contrary to their liking ; or, if any dean and chapter presumed to choose contrary to their liking, they frequently punished them for so doing. (See Prynne, on the fourth Instit. p. 321.) Afterwards, the king got the nomination, and the Pope the approbation. (See Burnet's Hist. of Reformation, vol. i. p. 11).

* De Marca, part ii. p. 296, 297. Vertot, Nominat. aux Eveschés de France.

I am sensible, indeed, that some persons, and those Protestants, are of opinion, that the practice of our kings and other monarchs in this case is far from any proof of right. It ought to be considered as an invasion upon the liberties of the church, which, in the primitive ages, vested the right of choosing bishops in the other comprovincial bishops, by a canon of the first council of Nice.

The objectors ought to shew, that there was either a divine unalterable appointment for this method, or that such a one is, in the nature of things, essential to the welfare of the church. But no divine or apostolical appointment, or at least none that was intended to be unalterable, can be shewn to have been made with regard to this matter. On the contrary, it appears, that the bishops were anciently chosen by the presbyters and people, as well as by the bishops of the province. Nor can this method of election by the comprovincial bishops, which the objectors would have take place, be essential, or constantly necessary, in the nature of things, to the welfare of the church. For it is plain, that the church hath long subsisted, and been in a flourishing condition, and been provided with very good bishops, upon the appointment of princes. Indeed, there is visibly a great expediency for this being done, in order to maintain that good correspondence between the civil government and the church, which is greatly subservient to the welfare of both.

And this being the case, it signifies nothing to allege a canon of the council of Nice (Can. 4. Col-

lier's Eccl. Hist. preface, vol. i. p. xiv.) prescribing this method of election by comprovincial bishops. For that council had not, nor could any council have, as I observed before, a right to determine any such matter, in which the welfare of several foreign kingdoms might be concerned, so as to exclude all changes that might be found necessary to be made for the safety or advantage of those kingdoms.

And, indeed, the church of Rome has, in effect, acknowledged, that the method of election then settled was not unalterable; for she has actually changed this method herself, and established that of election by the several deans and chapters pursuant to the nomination of princes, which is to be ratified by the Pope, as we have seen above.

END OF PART III.

THE
CHURCHMAN ARMED
AGAINST
THE ERRORS OF THE TIME.

PART IV.

POPERY.

THE foregoing tracts have, we trust, shewn our attentive readers the foundation of the Church universal, and of the Church of England. But, since the Church of Rome claims a supremacy over all churches, and insists that those who are not in communion with, nor subjection to, her, are no part of the true church, it becomes necessary to examine into these stupendous claims.

Now it would be difficult to find an instance where there was so little ground for any superiority, as in the case of the church of Rome over that of Britain. If we are to believe the Popish writers, Suarez and Baronius, this island received the faith nine years before Rome. (See Hammond, vol. ii. and page 105, and Bull's Letter in this collection). It is certain that, when Austin came to convert its inhabitants,

he found an episcopal establishment already in possession. So that the Roman pretence to superiority is unsupported by the premises on which it is built, as is fully explained in the following tracts. With respect to the succession from St. Peter, it too is involved in endless embarrassments. St. Peter was Prince of the Apostles, and, being Bishop of Rome, at his martyrdom, left his peculiar powers to the bishop who succeeded him. Hence his successor must have been superior to the surviving apostles; St. John for instance, as well as other bishops. But, if, as is most certain, the apostles were of a rank superior to the bishops, St. John, the last surviving apostle, must have died the superior or head of the Christian Church. Then how does it appear that his apostolical authority reverted, on his death, to the then Bishop of Rome, the fifth after St. Peter? Nay, it is exceedingly difficult to prove that St. Peter ever was at Rome; that being one of the most obscure points in Ecclesiastical History. Scripture affords us no evidence of it, nor any writer for the first 300 years. Therefore it is scarcely necessary to justify our revolt from papal usurpation, and our laying aside that load of ceremonies and errors which had been so plentifully attached to Christianity. Be it however understood, that our separation was no schism. Popish authority here was obtained by murder, preserved by the promotion of continual dissensions between the prince and his subjects, reluctantly submitted to at all times, and finally thrown off with the unanimous consent of the monarch and

the people. After the objections made by Luther, to Popery, had induced all serious men to examine for themselves, with what cautious prudence a reform was made in this country, the general approbation of all foreign churches abundantly proves. So evidently indeed did we retain all the essentials of Christianity, in the opinion of even Papists themselves, that Pope Pius the IVth is said to have offered Queen Elizabeth a confirmation of all she had done, provided his supremacy was acknowledged. (See Camden's Elizabeth, and Baker's Chron. An. 1560). This being refused, a spirit of animosity arose, which the lapse of three centuries has not extinguished. But Popery remains the same in its tenets and its practices. Nor to prove this truth should we refer to the histories of the Reformation, nor of the times immediately preceding that event, but to the rebellion and murders, which, during the last twenty years, have been perpetrated in Ireland, and which no impartial observer can suppose to have arisen from any other source than the rancour of papists against their fellow subjects, and the hope of success while our country was engaged with its inveterate foe, who at that time, had under his command nearly the whole of the continent. At that time, I repeat, when subjects of any loyalty would patiently have submitted to most grievances, rather than embarrass government, then, and how much less have agitated the whole kingdom for claims, which, if granted, would according to their own avowal, have conferred the bare possibility only, of enjoying places of honour,

and profit on a few. Against Popery therefore, such as it has been, such as, from its constituent principles, it ever must be, the Church of England remains the great bulwark of the Reformation, and to impress her sons with the nature of the errors she opposes, the following tracts are republished.

The first is a sermon preached by Forster, the learned editor of Plato, before the University of Oxford, November 5th 1746, and is distinguished for its almost prophetic character. The preacher undertook to prove, that the “ tendency of the “ doctrines and principles of popery is to promote “ the cause of scepticism, and to render the word of “ God of none effect, by destroying the credibility “ of it.” The well known state of religion, in Italy and France, previous to the late convulsions, shews the truth of this proposition. The forms of popery were submitted to avowedly in compliance with custom and prejudice. But that a literary man should give any credit to the gospels, was a phenomenon regarded with astonishment.

The second is by Bishop Bull, formerly of St. David's, who, deeply read in the ancient history of the universal church, shews the alterations and additions of the popish church to be corruptions unknown in the primitive times, and many of them, at their first appearance, condemned by different synods or provincial councils. This work is a manual for the student wishing to gain a scholastic knowledge of the controversy, and an intelligible abstract of ancient learning for the general reader.

On the other hand Dean Kipling's tract, relates to modern occurrences. It was occasioned by the republication of Ward's Errata, with the addition of much offensive matter. It forms another proof of the rancorous disposition of popery. We perceive the benumbed adder stinging, as soon as capable, the hand which fostered it. The infamous accusations brought, by the editor of Ward, against protestants, are clearly repelled. To have retorted them on the heads of the accusing party, would have been an easy task; for papists actually force the meaning of scripture as much as Socinians do its words. Nor are examples wanting of their being driven to that expedient also; witness *inter alia* the attempt made on Gen. chap. iii. ver. 15th to vindicate woman-worship. See Dupin, chap. xxxii. book ii. Besides, the perusal of this tract proves that no exertions are spared by Popish zealots, to spread their delusions among the lower classes, and that therefore it is incumbent on all who would manifest a love to God by active love to their fellow creatures, diligently to frustrate such endeavours.

The fourth essay is from the pen of the present learned Bishop of St. David's, Dr. Burgess, who by a collation of dates, has shewn, not merely the time when Christianity was first preached in this island, but that our episcopal form of church government was established here by St. Paul before his last visit to Rome. And since it is allowed on all hands, that the Roman episcopacy was then first instituted either by St. Paul alone, as is most probable,

●

or by him in conjunction with St. Peter, it follows of course, that, in point of time, the British church is prior to the Roman, and therefore can by no means admit any claim of superiority. For even that which Rome once claimed, as the seat of empire and metropolis of the world, was lost on the removal of that seat to Constantinople, and especially when she became dependant on, and tributary to, the exarchate of Ravenna in 566 or 8. (See Sigonius de Regno Italiæ. lib. 1. and Petavii Rat. Temp. Pt. 1. lib. 7. cap. 10.) The usurpations of that church were indeed posterior to those times, being after the revolt of Italy from the eastern empire.

Thus freed from Romish claims by historical evidence; the last tract, but the longest, enters into all the intricacies of the question, and is intituled, "The Case stated between the Churches of Rome and of England." It is composed by the famous Leslie, in the form of a Dialogue, between a Protestant Gentleman and a Popish Nobleman, who was likely to lose his Estate by the Bill of Abjuration. To readers acquainted with the controversial writings of the seventeenth century, it will be unnecessary to speak in praise of Leslie, the author of the incomparable and unanswerable tract, "A Short Method with a Deist." Now this dialogue being intended for the general reader, is admirably adapted for general comprehension, while at the same time it completely overturns the very foundations of popery. Thus, in discussing the claims of infallibility, he shews, that an infallible judge would be of no use to

the world, except every individual was infallibly certain who that judge was.

2dly. That the papists themselves are not agreed to whom or to what this infallibility is attached, there being among them four different opinions on the subject. He also points out as extremely worthy of notice, the resemblance between the image worship of the church of Rome, and the heathens, so that these may be defended from idolatry precisely by the same arguments, and have actually so defended themselves. (See Origen contra Celsum & Lucian.)

A table of contents being affixed, any farther analysis is unnecessary ;—but, from a careful perusal of these tracts, the reader will be convinced that the Roman church, so far from being supreme over all churches, is not the mother church of Europe ; certainly not of the British church ; and that none now in existence is farther gone from original purity in doctrine or in worship. By reflecting on the causes of our separation, he will learn to estimate the reasonableness of their conduct who have since separated from us, justifying their schism by our rejection of popish errors : but still more absurd will appear the unsteady conduct of modern christians, who seem to have lost all idea of unity, and think that a confusion of contradictory creeds is no offensive sight to the God of Truth.

POPERY DESTRUCTIVE OF THE EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

A SERMON, PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, AT ST. MARY'S, ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1746.

BY NATHANIEL FORSTER, B.D.

FELLOW OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE.

Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition.—Mark vii. 13.

THE principles and spirit of that church, whose unsuccessful attempts on our religion and liberties gave occasion for the present solemnity, have justly been observed to resemble in several respects those of Pharisaism among the Jews. Nor is there perhaps any circumstance in which they approach nearer to each other, than in being alike subject to the heavy imputation of “making the word of God of none effect through their traditions.” That our Romish adversaries are, on *many* accounts, liable to this charge, might easily be made appear. But I shall at present confine myself to *one* important article of it, namely, “*the tendency which their doctrines and*

principles have to promote the cause of scepticism and infidelity, and to render the word of God of none effect by destroying the credibility of it." A point this, which may deserve our attention, as it opens to us the true nature and spirit of Popery, is an answer to a like charge frequently brought by the church of Rome against the Reformation, and at the same time clears the Gospel from some of those aspersions, which our modern unbelievers have so industriously raked from the corruptions of it. In pursuance, therefore, of this design, I shall first enquire how far Popery affects those distinguishing characteristics of Christianity, which constitute its internal evidence; and secondly examine in like manner the effect it has on the external proofs of it. And first, the advocates for Christianity generally begin with observing the great expediency of a clear, comprehensive, and determinate written system of religion, and the probability thence arising, that something of this kind may have been afforded us by God. And as this character is, they apprehend, sufficiently visible in the Gospel revelation, they justly esteem it no inconsiderable circumstance in favour of its pretensions to a divine original. But the avowed principles of the Romish church, require us to look upon the holy Scriptures in a very different light, to consider them as so imperfect even in the most necessary point of faith and practice, that oral tradition must be called in to their assistance, so obscure and indeterminate in some of the fundamental articles of our religion, that no private

person can be sufficiently secure of their true meaning, and so liable to be perverted and abused, that they cannot even safely be trusted with the bulk of mankind. Admirable characteristics these of a divine revelation, and extremely proper to inspire a sense of its importance, and a favourable presumption of its supposed authority !

But secondly, from this general view of the revelation itself, let us proceed to the doctrines contained in it. And here the first question which arises concerning them, is, whether they are agreeable to right reason ? For if any one of them, when properly understood, is plainly contrary to it, this is of itself sufficient to destroy the authority of the whole revelation. Doctrines may indeed undoubtedly be supposed to proceed from God, which mere unassisted reason could not have discovered, and which, when revealed, are still in some respects so far above our reason, that we may be unable perfectly to comprehend them. These, whatever difficulties may attend any attempt to be wise above what is written in a particular explanation of them, may yet justly be admitted under the notion of mysteries. But where the case is different, where the nature of the subject is such, that we have the same clear and perfect view of it, which we have of any other that falls within the reach of our understandings, a doctrine which is contained in a pretended revelation, and yet plainly contradicts those principles and observations by which we judge of all other objects, is not only to be rejected itself as absurd, but exposes likewise the

whole system of which it is a part, to our contempt and ridicule. And such, if any such there be, is this assertion of the church of Rome, that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, one finite natural body is really and substantially changed into another, whilst every circumstance by which we can possibly distinguish one body from another, remains perfectly the same. An absurdity so glaring, that notwithstanding the vast multitude of dark terms and unmeaning distinctions with which the subtle defenders of it have endeavoured to palliate this vile blunder of their ignorant ancestors, it effectually, if it be the doctrine of Christ, overthrows the credibility of his Gospel; not to mention that the writers of the Romish church have frequently done their utmost to strengthen this objection, by representing (in order to make us give up our understandings entirely in matters of religion) faith and reason as equally at variance with each other throughout the whole system of Christianity.

The next thing worthy our notice in the internal evidence of the Gospel, is the purity and excellence of its morality, or in other words, the supposed tendency of its doctrines and precepts to recommend to us the most exalted scheme of virtue, and to enforce the universal practice of it by every the most prevailing consideration imaginable. This is a circumstance which is not indeed sufficient of itself to prove the divine authority of our religion, and yet the want of it could not but conclude strongly to its disadvantage. The tendency there-

fore of any single doctrine to the contrary, to serve the interests of vice, or weaken the obligations to virtue, becomes a considerable objection to it. And is not Christianity, as it stands upon the plan of our Romish adversaries, visibly liable to this objection? For, not to insist on some of the infamous maxims of their casuists, (because though approved by too many, they are yet disavowed by others; not to insist, I say, on these), is it not evidently destructive of the necessity of a good life, to suppose that the priest is invested with a judicial authority to forgive sins, and that a very imperfect degree of sorrow for them, arising merely from fear of punishment (such an one indeed as the most hardened sinner will sometimes feel, and which may produce only some faint and sudden thoughts of amendment) that such attrition sufficiently qualifies us for this authoritative absolution? So that all the hazard which the most wicked man runs of his salvation, is only the danger of so sudden a death as gives him no space for the momentary act, on which his happiness depends; a chance, which whoever is strongly addicted to his vices, will be too apt to run, when remission of them may at any time be had on such easy terms.

Further, the great and indeed only sufficient enforcement of virtue with the bulk of mankind, arises from a conviction that their behaviour here absolutely determines them to eternal happiness or misery hereafter, and that nothing to be done by others can atone for the want of what they may and ought to do

for themselves. If then the Gospel really teaches a purgatory ; or, that, besides the eternal state of torment which it threatens, there is another, the punishments of which are only temporary, and that these may be alleviated by what others may do for us, the whole force of the former is at once effectually eluded by the latter. Few even of the most abandoned sinners will be induced to think so ill of their own case, as not to imagine others more wicked than themselves, for whom alone the worst is reserved. Each will rank himself in the number of those, whom some degree of temporary punishment must at last restore to the divine favour. And when this point is once gained, the doctrine of masses, penances and indulgences is ready at hand, to dissipate the poor remainder of those guilty fears, which natural conscience might otherwise have kept alive in him.

To these doctrines, so evidently destructive of private virtue, the solemnity of this day calls upon us to join the scandalous but avowed principles and practices of Popery with respect to civil society. Its pretended right not only to persecute single persons, but to devote whole nations to destruction on account of religion, and the repeated execution of such horrid sentences by the blackest treachery, and most inhuman massacres. Add to these, that absurd and detestable position, which both our Romish princes since the Reformation have given us sufficient reason to remember, that the most solemn promises and compacts made with heretics are either void in themselves, or at least, whenever they at all affect the in-

terests of the church, may entirely be dissolved by her authority. A position this so destructive of all mutual confidence, that if men were not sometimes better than their principles oblige them to be, we might justly consider the members of that communion as persons of no faith, and enemies to human society.

To say then that such doctrines and practices barely affect the particular argument above mentioned in favour of the Gospel arising from the supposed excellence of its morality, would be giving up the point I am concerned to prove. Since they entirely destroy the very credibility of any system with which they are connected, unless we can suppose it consistent with the wisdom and goodness of God to reveal to us a scheme of duty, which instead of improving the law of nature, tends to weaken and corrupt it. The same observations may with equal justice be extended to the religious principles and practices of the church of Rome. It was the distinguishing glory of the Gospel revelation, according to our notions of it, that it effectually overthrew the polytheism, idolatry, and superstition of the heathen world, and substituted the most rational and spiritual worship of the one true God in the place of them. But has not Popery studiously as it were effaced this illustrious evidence of Christianity, by reviving the Pagan superstition under a somewhat different appearance? By the adoration of the cross and other images, by the veneration it pays to saints and angels, by the introduction of such a vast and continually increasing

multitude of imaginary mediators, that the homage which is due by the light of reason to the Almighty Father of the Universe, and by the Christian scheme to our divine Redeemer and Sanctifier, is almost totally obscured and swallowed up by them.

Much, however, has been said by the writers of the Romish communion to vindicate themselves from this heavy imputation. But it is their misfortune, that they do not more nearly resemble their heathen masters in their plan, than in all the several pretences, by which they have endeavoured to palliate the absurdity of it. The glorious and exalted state of these objects of religious veneration; the limited nature of the regard paid to them, founded principally on the notion of a delegated authority from the supreme God, and their mediation with him for us; the reasonableness of supposing them employed in this and other kind offices, particularly for any nation or set of men, to whom they have heretofore born some relation, or who may have humbly placed a peculiar dependance upon them; the usefulness of immediately addressing ourselves to some visible symbols or representations of these our benefactors, to heighten our devotion to them; and lastly, the infinite sense at the same time expressed of the majesty of the supreme God, by thus acknowledging ourselves unworthy to hold a more direct and constant intercourse with him: all these ingenious and plausible topics, together with an affected readiness to disclaim any thing which popular practice might have established inconsistently with them; all these

topics were originally the offspring, not of the dry, pedantic schools of the Romish communion, but of the more refined and specious assertors of the heathen theology. It would, therefore, be a considerable reflection upon Christianity, to suppose it to have demolished that pompous, but useless and ill grounded fabrick, only to erect another of an insipid and Gothic model on the same foundation.

But the foundation, it may be pretended, was good, and the only reason for destroying the heathen temples arose from their being polluted by the unworthiness of their inhabitants, from their being peopled either with imaginary beings, or with such at least as if really existing, were too contemptible and odious in the sight of God, to be of any advantage to their votaries. Whereas the Christian shrines are adorned with objects every way deserving our veneration, with the great instruments of Providence in revealing the will of God to mankind, and the brightest examples of heroic courage and constancy in their adherence to it, persons who may reasonably be supposed to stand high in the divine favour, and who cannot but be concerned for the professors of that religion, which it was their peculiar honour to have established and supported. And yet the Romish church seems, as it were, to have industriously deprived herself of the benefit even of this consideration, which though it could not have justified a species of worship that is thus wrong in itself, yet might, in some measure, have lessened the mean-ness and absurdity of it. For, not to enter into a

minute detail of particulars, it is notorious that many of her saints are as much the children of fancy as some of the heathen deities; that others which did really exist, were persons, for whom perhaps it might have been better, if they had never been; and lastly, that the bulk of them, though more innocent, were yet so extravagantly ridiculous, that whoever reads the accounts which are given of them by their professed admirers, must take them for fools or madmen, and the religion of which they are represented as the great exemplars, to be the wild product of an enthusiastic and distempered imagination. But neither the groveling superstition of the vulgar, nor the more elevated and romantic enthusiasm of her saints, could so strongly have affected the credibility of the Gospel, if they had not been carefully supported and encouraged by wiser heads as the engines of worldly policy. The wood, hay, stubble, which was laid by those ignorant builders on the foundation of Christianity, might easily have been removed, if vile as they were in themselves, they had not been the fittest materials for erecting an arbitrary and lucrative dominion over the consciences of mankind. That this is the light in which Popery ought principally to be considered, is evident; since, in every other view, it appears to be a strange and unaccountable complication of the most trifling absurdities: whereas, when this mirror is once applied, it immediately becomes a wise, regular, and uniform system, every part of which is in some degree subservient to its great design of ingrossing to

itself the wealth and power of the universe. The tendency of its distinguishing doctrines, principles, and practices, to this one point, has often been demonstrated, and might easily be shewn at large, were it not a much fitter subject for a treatise of politics, than a religious enquiry.

Hence, then, the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom, with all the internal characters of its divine original arising from it, is effectually destroyed, and the Gospel is rendered, what its adversaries have always endeavoured to represent it as being, a mixture of worldly policy, superstition, and enthusiasm. In this view of things, the argument drawn from the sudden and extensive progress of our religion, vanishes at once; it being no way surprising, that a scheme so indulgent to vulgar notions and corruptions, and so well calculated to render it the interest of the more knowing part of mankind to impose upon the weaker, should be attended with all imaginary success. Nay, even the sufferings of the first preachers of the Gospel can no longer be depended upon as a proof of their sincerity. Since impostors are sometimes known to fall a sacrifice to a favourite project, the advantage arising from which, if they could have put it in execution, would have sufficiently rewarded them for the dangers they underwent in support of it. But these reflections more properly belong to what I secondly proposed to consider, the effect which Popery has on the external evidence of our religion.

This indeed is a point, which after what has been already observed, it may seem needless to insist upon.

For if Popery has so far altered the very spirit and genius of Christianity, as to render it a system evidently unworthy of a divine original, the consideration of any facts that can be brought in support of such a revelation is entirely precluded by it; they can at most amount but to an high degree of moral evidence in its favour, whereas arguments drawn from the internal nature of a religion may fall little, if at all, short of demonstration against it. A few general reflections, therefore, will suffice for the present subject of our enquiry. And the first which naturally occurs, and which has, therefore, been often handled at large, is the effect which the doctrine of transubstantiation necessarily has on the evidence of sense in matters of religion, and consequently on miracles, as depending entirely on this evidence; a point which cannot perhaps be set in a clearer light, than by considering it with a particular view to the fundamental miracle of Christianity, the resurrection of its author. For what could even an eye-witness of this fact, supposing him at the same time to teach the doctrine of transubstantiation, possibly say in defence of the former, which might not be immediately retorted upon him with regard to the latter by his heathen adversary? If he alledges that every outward circumstance that can be imagined, conspired to beget in him a full persuasion, that the person and body of Christ were evidently the same both before and after his crucifixion, the other may with equal reason and certainty reply, that the like combination of circumstances equally conspires to

convince him that the bread and wine after their consecration remain as evidently the same, nor is there any one of the most subtle distinctions which the church of Rome has invented, that can in the least degree turn the scale in her favour. But if the case stands thus even with an eye-witness of our Saviour's resurrection, how much more directly does it incline to the side of infidelity with regard to us at present, who must depend on the remote testimony of others for this and the like facts in support of Christianity, and have at the same time, upon this her scheme, an infinitely better evidence, that of our own senses, to the contrary.

Nor is this the only instance in which Popery strikes at the miracles of Christ and his apostles. The constant pretensions which the church of Rome has made to a power of the same extraordinary nature, and the little, low artifices, to which she has had recourse in order to support this her imaginary claim, visibly tend to vilify the very notion of miracles, and derogate from the effect they would otherwise have on the minds of men. Nay, will not an unbeliever, that resides within the pale of the Romish church, thus naturally reason with himself? "The first Christians are said to have been converted to the belief of the Gospel by miracles of which they were either eye-witnesses themselves, or of the reality of which they had the living testimonies of others who were so. And the church which informs me of this, informs me also, that she has constantly been, and still is, invested with the like extraordinary power of

performing them. May not I, therefore, as the same means of conviction by which the first Christians were persuaded of the truth of their religion, still subsist, safely suspend my judgement concerning it, till they are afforded me? Or if this be too much for every single person to expect, ought I not to begin my enquiry with examining into such as are said to have been wrought nearest to my own time, and when I have considered a proper number of them, rest the merits of the cause principally on these?" That this is on many accounts the most natural method of proceeding in the case here supposed, cannot be denied. Nor is it difficult to determine what would too often be the result of it, if we consider how ill disposed a person must be to pay a proper attention to the more antient miracles of Christ and his apostles, who has before hand gradually detected a continued series of imposture for several ages together in their supposed successors.

It is, therefore, the peculiar honour and happiness of the Reformation to have rescued the original evidences of Christianity from this almost insuperable prejudice against them; to have referred the unbeliever to them for his conviction; and to have properly directed him in forming his judgement concerning them, by laying down such easy rules with regard to the nature of the actions themselves, the end for which they were performed, and the other circumstances relating to them, that these substantial miracles are almost at first view equally distinguishable from the visionary prodigies either of antient or modern Rome.

To these observations others may be added, particularly the tendency which Popery has to weaken the credit of those records, by which alone the evidences of the Gospel are at this distance of time sincerely conveyed to us. This the church of Rome effects, partly by resting it, not on those natural proofs, by which that of all other writings is supported, but on her own authority, (an authority, which not only no one can admit, according to her notions of it, till he is previously convinced of the validity of her charter, but which has likewise been to much impaired by the many notorious forgeries she has been convicted of, to be almost heard even as a common evidence) and partly by her endeavours to put her oral traditions upon an equal footing with these original records of Christianity; an attempt, which however it may be intended only to serve her private purposes with regard to the former, may yet easily be improved by an unbeliever to the manifest disadvantage of the latter.

Upon this short survey then of the principal circumstances, that constitute the evidence of our religion, it appears that the force and lustre of each of them is considerably weakened, and the nature of them so entirely changed by the peculiar doctrines, principles, and practices of the church of Rome, that they amount to a direct proof of the contrary. This, therefore, may in the *first* place be applied, as an answer to a like charge brought by her against the Reformation, as tending to encourage a spirit of scepticism and infidelity. Since in every one of the

above mentioned particulars, we have, by departing from her communion, in effect obviated so many different and fundamental objections to the truth of Christianity ; and consequently have done the utmost in our power to establish a firm and well-grounded belief of it. But infidelity has long ago openly set up its standard among us, whereas no attempts of this kind disturb her repose. And wonderful indeed it would be, if the abuse of liberty should be found, where liberty itself does not exist. That man must have an uncommon degree of resolution, who should venture to make a formal attack upon the avowed doctrines of Christianity, in places where it is so dangerous to drop the least insinuation against the most suspicious notions of Popery. But do the objectors really perceive no tendency to scepticism and infidelity among the members of their own communion ? Did they never observe, that in proportion to the restraints that are laid on men's words and actions in matters of religion, there arises in the gayer part of mankind a total indifference about it ; and that those who do think at all, generally carry their suspicions to the greatest length, when they are prevented from speaking out ? If this is not the case, if there is no considerable evil of this kind lurking among them, why all those dastardly apprehensions at every the least symptom of it ? why all those unwarrantable and barbarous methods of imprisonment, torture, death, to stifle it immediately at its birth ? Precautions which in an age like this the credit of their religion would prevent them from using, if they

were not abundantly convinced of their necessity. Besides, the question is not so properly concerning the place in which infidelity is professed, as about the cause which originally gave rise to it, and the notions by which it is principally supported. Let the church of Rome, therefore, satisfy herself and us with relation to the following particulars, whether the arrogant demand of a blind and unlimited obedience to ecclesiastical authority, joined to the observation that this deference was foolishly paid and abused to the worst purposes for several centuries together, is not apt to inspire men with a disgust for all submission to ecclesiastical authority? Whether the detection of a long series of the most impudent forgeries and impostures may not easily give rise to such a suspicious turn of mind, as is destructive even of that reliance on the testimony of former ages, which is necessary to the support of any standing revelation? And lastly, whether by obtruding some vile and palpable absurdities under the venerable notion of mysteries, she has not afforded too great an handle to superficial enquirers to reject every thing they cannot see clearly into, as useless or incredible? And if these considerations are not sufficient to account for the origin and progress of infidelity amongst us, it may perhaps be in some respects indirectly owing to the Reformation. Since by representing in the strongest light the indispensableness of a sincere obedience to the genuine precepts of the Gospel, it has forced many to become its avowed adversaries, whom the more indulgent casuistry of the

Romish church might have retained in their nominal adherence to the profession of Christianity.

Secondly, the above reflections concerning the manner and degree in which Popery affects the credibility of the Gospel, point out to us the true nature and genius of it. We may hence, perceive, that it is a system, the falsehood of which in several of its fundamental articles appears, not merely from a critical examination of the darker passages in holy scripture, or even its inconsistency with other doctrines more plainly delivered in it, but as it stands condemned by the common principles and natural sentiments of mankind. That, as on this account, it is unable to subsist itself on the footing of right reason, so it tends, moreover, to involve the whole fabric of Christianity in one common ruin with it; and that this its baneful influence reaches not only to those external circumstances by which the Gospel is supported, but penetrates into the very substance of it, alters its nature, defeats its end, and debases the most exalted and rational scheme of religion into an impure mixture of worldly policy, superstition, and enthusiasm.

Such was the yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear, and which, by our providential deliverances from the repeated attempts that have been made to bring us again into subjection to it, has so justly given occasion for this day's solemnity;—a solemnity, which can need no enforcement to the constant and proper observance of it,—if we consider,

Thirdly, that these attempts on our religion and liberties were not so much the casual effects of the private wickedness or folly of particular persons, as the necessary result of the nature and spirit of the system they embraced. This the uniform proceedings of the Romish church in numberless past instances, and her behaviour at present, wherever she is fully able to exert herself, sufficiently demonstrate. And yet Popery, it is pretended, has taken a milder turn, and the professors of it have been so far humanized by the learning and refinement of these latter ages, that they are no longer now those savage persecutors and factious disturbers of society, which they formerly were. That this may indeed be the case of many private persons of that persuasion will not be denied. But what solid dependence can reasonably be placed on any supposed change of disposition, arising merely from a particular conjuncture of circumstances, and which may perhaps make men better, than their belief, if they acted consistently with it, would allow them to be? For the temper of that religion towards those that dissent from it, whatever different appearances policy may require it to put on, is, and must be invariably the same. It is founded on the very first principles of the church of Rome, and the light in which they oblige her to look upon herself and us;—upon herself, as the mother and mistress of all other churches, the sole depository of the Catholic tradition, and the final and infallible judge of all controversies concerning it;—upon us, not as persons differing from her in opinion, but as

rebels to her authority ; as the subverters of a society, to which the rights and concerns of all others are to give way ; and as doomed on these accounts to so deplorable a state hereafter, that common charity requires her to use every remedy in her power, how painful soever it may seem, for our recovery, or if that be impossible, to prevent us at least from involving others in the like calamity with ourselves.

Lastly, if to the light in which she views herself and us, we add that in which she appears to us, we cannot but see at once the intimate connection of fraud and violence with such a combination of superstition and imposture, and that the temper of Popery, if we are ever so unhappy as to give it an opportunity of exerting itself, will be always no less destructive of our civil and religious constitution, than its doctrines are of the spirit and design of the Gospel.

May these and the like considerations, therefore, inspire us with a just sense of the manifold blessings, which were, on this day, vouchsafed to us, in our deliverance both from the horrid conspiracy and the more recent dominion of Popery, and particularly in the present consequence of the latter, the establishment of a succession of Protestant princes on the throne of these kingdoms. May this establishment be as lasting as it is necessary to our welfare. May all attempts to defeat it be attended with the success they deserve. And may neither our vices nor dissensions derogate from the value of these blessings, or provoke the Almighty to withdraw them from us,

THE 'CORRUPTIONS OF THE CHURCH
OF ROME,

IN RELATION TO ECCLESIASTICAL GOVERNMENT, THE
RULE OF FAITH, AND FORM OF DIVINE WORSHIP;
IN ANSWER TO THE BISHOP OF MEAUX'S QUERIES.

BY DR. BULL,
LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,
A LETTER OF BISHOP BULL.

From a MS. in Lambeth Library.

A Letter from the Bishop of MEAUX to ROBERT NELSON, Esq.; upon his having read Dr. BULL's Book [entituled Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Trium Primorum Seculorum de necessitate credendi, quod Dominus noster Jesus Christus, sit verus Deus] presented to him by that worthy Gentleman.

To Mr. NELSON, at Blackheath.



St. Germaine en Laye, 24 July 1700.

I RECEIVED, Sir, about a fortnight ago, the honour of your letter from Blackheath near London, dated the 18th of July of the last year, when, at the

same time you sent me Dr. Bull's book entituled *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, &c. I must first, Sir, acquaint you that the sight of your hand and name gave me a great deal of joy, and that I was extremely pleased with this testimony of your remembrance. As to Dr. Bull's performance, I was willing to read it all over before I acknowledged the receipt of it, that I might be able to give you my sense of it. It is admirable, and the matter he treats could not be explained with greater learning and greater judgment. This is what I desire you would be pleased to acquaint him with, and, at the same time, with the unfeigned congratulations of all the clergy of France, assembled in this place, for the service he does the Catholick church in so well defending her determination of the necessity of believing the divinity of the Son of God. Give me leave to acquaint him, there is one thing I wonder at, which is, that so great a man, who speaks so advantageously of the church, of salvation which is obtained only in unity with her, and of the infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost in the Council of Nice; which infers the same assistance for all others assembled in the same church, can continue a moment without acknowledging her. Or either, Sir, let him vouchsafe to tell me, who am a zealous defender of the doctrine he teaches, what it is he means by the term *Catholick church*? Is it the church of Rome, and those that adhere to her? Is it the church of England? Is it a confused heap of societies, separated the one from the other? And how can they be

that kingdom of Christ not divided against itself, and which never shall perish? It would be a great satisfaction to me to receive some answer upon this subject, that might explain the opinion of so weighty and solid an author. I very much rejoice at the good news you send me of your lady's welfare, whom I heartily pray for, with you and your family. You have been rightly informed in the account you have received of the admirable qualifications of the Archbishop of Paris, now Cardinal de Noailles. The see of St. Denis has not, for a long time, been so worthily filled. If Mr. Collier, whom you mention, has written any thing in Latin concerning the *modern mystical divinity*, you will oblige me in conveying it to me. But, above all, remember that I am, with a great deal of sincerity,

Sir,

Your most humble, and

most obedient servant,

✠ J. BENIGNE, *Bishop of Meaux.*

Dr. BULL's Answer.

Sect. I. The approbation of my writings by so learned and illustrious a prelate as Monsieur de Meaux, especially when joined with the congratulations of the learned clergy of France in general, is so high an honour done me, that if I did not set a great value on it, I were altogether unworthy of it.

But as to the wonder of Monsieur de Meaux, I cannot but very much wonder at it, especially at the reasons on which it is grounded. He wonders *how I that speak so advantageously of the Church, &c. can continue a moment without acknowledging her.* Her! What her doth the Bishop mean? Doubtless, the present church of Rome, in the communion whereof he himself lives, and to which his design seems to be to invite me. But where do I speak so advantageously of the present church of Rome? No where, I am sure. My thoughts concerning her, I have plainly (perhaps too plainly and bluntly in the opinion of Monsieur de Meaux) delivered in the book which he so commends, *Jud. Eccl. Cathol. cap. 5. §. 3.* where having spoken of that singular purity of the faith which was in the church of Rome in the first ages, and taken notice of, and extolled by some of the primitive fathers, I thus conclude: “ Oh, that so great a happiness, such purity of faith, “ had always continued in that church! But, alas! “ we may now cry out in the holy prophet’s words, “ *How is the faithful city become an harlot?* Isai. “ 1. 21.”

But Monsieur de Meaux seems to think the Roman and the Catholick church to be convertible terms, which is strange in so learned a man, especially at this time of the day. Cannot the Catholick church be mentioned, but presently the Roman church must be understood? The book which the Bishop refers to, bears this title, *Judicium Ecclesiae Catholicae trium primorum seculorum, &c.* Of the Ca-

tholick Church of the three first centuries, I do indeed speak with great deference. To her judgment (next to the Holy Scriptures) I appeal against the oppugners of our Lord's divinity at this day, whether Arians or Socinians. The rule of faith, the symbols or creeds, the profession whereof was, in those ages, the condition of communion with the *Catholick church* (mentioned by Irenæus, Tertulian, and others), I heartily and firmly believe. This *primitive Catholick church*, as to her government and discipline, her doctrines of faith, and her worship of God, I think ought to be the standard by which we are to judge of the orthodoxy and purity of all other succeeding churches, according to that excellent rule of Tertullian,* *de Præscript. adv. Hæres. cap. xx. xxi.* "Every descent must necessarily deduce itself from its first original. If these things are true, it is plain that every doctrine which these apostolical, these original and mother-churches held as analogous to the rule of faith, is to be owned as true, and as containing, without doubt, what the churches received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God; but that all other doctrine is to be looked upon as false, and no ways savouring of those truths which have been delivered by the churches, and the Apostles, and Christ, and God." And to the same purpose he discourseth, *cap. 31. ejusdem libris.*

According to this rule, the church of England

* Vide Apoc. 34. et Conc. Ephes. can. 8.

will be found the best and purest church this day in the christian world. Upon which account, I bless God that I was born, baptized, and bred up in his communion; wherein I firmly resolve by his grace to persist, as long as I live. How far the present church of Rome hath departed from this primitive pattern, will appear hereafter.

Monsieur de Meaux adds, as a farther reason for his wonder, *that I speak of salvation as only to be found in unity with her.* Her! doth the bishop here again mean the present church of Rome? If he doth, I must plainly tell him, that I am so far from ever thinking, that salvation is only to be found in unity with her, that, on the contrary, I verily believe they are in great danger of their salvation who live in her communion; that is, who own her erroneous doctrines, and join in her corrupt worship of which I shall give a large account before I have done. I do, indeed, in the book which the bishop hath an eye unto, shew, that there was no canon or rule of faith received in the primitive church, which, whoever in any point thereof denied or opposed, was judged an heretick, and if he persisted in his heresy, cast out of the communion of the catholick church, and so out of the ordinary way of salvation. But what is this to the present church of Rome and her communion?

The bishop's last reason is, *that I own the infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost, in the Council of Nice, which infers the same assistance for all others assembled in the same church.* To which I

answer, I mention this indeed as the opinion of Socrates, but at the same time I give another account of the credit that is to be given to the determination of the Nicene Council in the article of our Saviour's Divinity, in the *Præmium* of my *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ*, §. 3. where my words are these:

“ But the same Socrates, chap. ix. of the same
“ book, reproves Sabinus for not considering with
“ himself, that they who came to this council,
“ how illiterate soever they were, yet being enlight-
“ ened by God, and the grace of the Holy Ghost,
“ could in no wise depart from the truth. For he
“ seems to have thought the enlightening grace of
“ the Holy Ghost always to accompany a General
“ Council of Bishops, and to preserve them from
“ error, especially in any of the necessary articles
“ of faith. Which supposition, if any one shall
“ refuse to admit of, Socrates's argumentation may
“ be thus directed and urged against him: the
“ Nicene fathers, let any imagine them as unskilful
“ and illiterate as he will, yet, in the main, were
“ doubtless pious men: but it is incredible that so
“ many holy and approved men, assembled from all
“ parts of the christian world (who, how defective
“ soever in any other sort of knowledge, could by
“ no means be ignorant of the first and fundamental
“ doctrine of the Holy Trinity, a doctrine wherein
“ the very Catechumens were not uninstructed, or
“ of what themselves had received from their prede-
“ cessors concerning it), should wickedly conspire
“ amongst themselves, to new model the faith

“ received in the church concerning this principal
 “ article of christianity.” And, indeed, all these
 things considered and laid together, it was morally
 impossible that the Nicene fathers should have
 erred, in the determination of the article before
 them. And that they did not actually err, I have
 sufficiently proved in the bishop’s own judgment, in
 the following treatise.

But suppose I were fully of Socrates’s opinion,
 concerning the infallible assistance of the Holy
 Ghost attending every truly General Council in
 matters of faith, I should be never the nearer to
 the communion of the church of Rome, as it is
 now subjected to the decrees of the Trent Council.
 For as I afterwards add in the same Preface, §. 8.
 “ The assembly at Trent is to be called by any
 “ other name, rather than that of a General
 “ Council.”

I proceed to the bishop’s questions. He asks me
what I mean by the Catholick church? I answer:
 What I mean by the *Catholick church* in the book
 which he all along refers to, I have already shewn,
 and the very title of the book sufficiently declares.
 If he asks me what I mean by the Catholick church,
 speaking of it as now it is? I answer: By the
 Catholick church, I mean the Church Universal,
 being a collection of all the churches throughout the
 world, who retain *the faith* (ἀπαξ) *once delivered to*
the Saints. Jude, 3. That is who hold and profess
 in the substance of it, that faith and religion which
 was delivered by the Apostles of Christ to the first

original churches according to Tertullian's rule before-mentioned. Which faith and religion is contained in the Holy Scriptures, especially of the New Testament, and the main fundamentals of it comprized in the canon or rule of faith, universally received throughout the primitive churches, and the profession thereof acknowledged to be a sufficient *tessera* or *badge* of a Catholick Christian. All the churches at this day which hold and profess this faith and religion, however distant in place, or distinguished by different rites and ceremonies, yea, or divided in some extra-fundamental points of doctrine, yet agreeing in the essentials of the Christian religion, make up together one Christian Catholick church under the Lord Christ, the Supreme Head thereof. The Catholick church under this notion, is not a *confused heap of societies, separated one from another*. But it seems no other union of the church will satisfy the bishop, but an union of all the churches of Christ throughout the world, under one visible head, having a jurisdiction over them all, and that head the Bishop of Rome for the time being. But such an union as this was never dreamed of among Christians for at least the first six hundred years, as shall be shewn in its due place.

The Catholick Church, I believe, shall never totally fail, that is, Christianity shall never utterly perish from the face of the earth, but there shall be some to maintain and uphold it to the end of the world; although some of the ancient doctors of the

church have given us a very tragical description the state of the Universal Church of Christ, who shall be under the reign of the great Antichrist. But I know of no promise of indefectibility from the faith made to any particular church, no, not to the church of Rome itself. And if we judge by the Holy Scriptures, and by the doctrine and practice of the primitive Catholick church, the present church of Rome hath already lamentably failed, and fallen into many dangerous and gross errors, as will by and by appear. Now that church which hath already so far failed, why may she not utterly fail? If she be found but in one error, in the infallible direction of her judgement, upon which her indefectibility from the faith must depend, gone and destroyed. I add, that divers eminent doctors, even of the Roman communion, have discovered out of the Apocalypse, that Rome itself shall at length become the seat of Antichrist. So, where will the church of Rome then be?

But I wonder why Monsieur de Meaux should ask me, whether by the Catholick church, I mean the church of Rome or the church of England? I know full well, I mean neither the one nor the other. For to say either of the church of Rome or of the church of England, or of the Greek church, or of any other particular church of whatever denomination soever, that it is the Catholic or Universal Church, would be as absurd as to affirm that

a part is the whole. And to be sure I never meant the church of Rome to be the Catholick church exclusively to all other churches. I am so far from any such meaning, that my constant judgment of the church of Rome hath been, that if she may be allowed still to remain a *part* or *member* of the Catholick church (which hath been questioned by some learned men, upon grounds and reasons not very easy to be answered), yet she is certainly a very unsound and corrupted one, and sadly degenerated from her primitive purity. This I must insist upon, and have obliged myself to prove; and I prove it thus :

Sect. II. The church of Rome hath quite altered the *primitive Ecclesiastical Government*, changed the *primitive Canon* or *Rule of Faith*, and miserably corrupted the *primitive Liturgy* or *Form* of *Divine Worship*.

1st. She hath quite altered the *primitive Ecclesiastical Government*, by erecting a monarchy in the church, and setting up her bishop as the universal pastor and governour of the whole Catholick church, and making all other bishops to be but his vicars and substitutes, as to their jurisdiction.

For that the bishop of Rome had no such universal jurisdiction in the primitive times, is most evident from the sixth canon of the first Nicene Council, occasioned, as it appears, by the schism of Meletius, an ambitious bishop in Egypt, who took upon him to ordain bishops there, without the consent of the metropolitan Bishop of Alexandria.

The words of the canon are these : *Let the ancient customs prevail that are in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have the power over them all, for as much as the Bishop of Rome also hath the like custom. In like manner, in Antioch, and all other provinces, let the privileges be preserved to the churches.* From this canon it is plain, that the three metropolitan bishops, or *primates* (they were not as yet, I think, called *patriarchs*) of Alexandria, Rome, and Antioch, had their distinct jurisdictions, each independent on the other; and that all other chief bishops or *primates* of provinces, had the same privileges which are here confirmed to them. It is true, this canon doth not particularly describe or determine what the bounds are of the Roman bishop's power, as neither doth it the limits of the Bishop of Antioch's jurisdiction, but only those of the Bishop of Alexandria's province. The reason hereof is manifest, the case of the Bishop of Alexandria only was at this time laid before the synod, whose jurisdiction in Egypt had been lately invaded by the schismatical ordinations of Meletius, as I before observed. But that the Roman bishop's power, as well as that of the other metropolitans, had its bounds, is most manifest from the example that is drawn from thence, for the limits of other churches. For what an absurd thing is it, that the church of Rome should be made the pattern for assigning the limits to other metropolitan churches, if that church also had not her known limits at the same time when this canon was made.

Intolerable is the exposition which Bellarmin, and other Romanists, give of these words of the canon ; *for as much as the Bishop of Rome also hath the like custom ; i. e.* (they say), “ It was the custom of the Bishop of Rome to permit, or leave to the Bishop of Alexandria, the *regimen* of Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis.” Certainly, *τῶτο Συμβέβηκεν* implies a like custom in the church of Alexandria, and in the church of Rome ; and the sense of the canon is most evident, that the Bishop of Alexandria should, according to the ancient custom of the church (not by the permission of the Roman bishop), enjoy the full power in his province, as by the like ancient custom, the Bishop of Rome had the jurisdiction of his. But they that would see this canon fully explained and cleared from all the trifling cavils and exceptions of the Romanists, may consult the large and copious annotations of the learned Dr. Beveridge, Bishop of St. Asaph, upon it, where they will receive ample satisfaction.

Thus was the government of the Catholick church, in the primitive times, distributed among the several chief bishops or primates of the provinces, neither of them being accountable to the other, but all of them to an *Œcumenical* Council, which was then held to be the only supreme visible judge of controversies arising in the church, and to have the power of finally deciding them. Hence the case of the Bishop of Alexandria, before-mentioned, was not brought before the Bishop of Rome, or any other metropolitan, but referred to the fathers of

the Nicene Council, to be finally determined by them.

The universal pastorship or government of the Catholick church, was never claimed by any bishop till towards the end of the sixth century, and then it was thought to be challenged by John, Patriarch of Constantinople, assuming to himself the title of Œcumenical or Universal Bishop; whom Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome, vehemently opposed, pronouncing him the forerunner of Antichrist, who durst usurp so arrogant a title. And it is worthy observing how passionately the same Gregory expresseth his detestation of the pride and arrogance of the Patriarch of Constantinople, in his letter to Mauritius, the Emperour: “* I am forced to cry out, “ O the times! O the manners! All things in “ the parts of Europe are delivered up to the power “ of barbarous people. Cities are destroyed, castles demolished, provinces depopulated, &c. and “ yet the bishops, who ought to have lain prostrate “ on the ground, covered with ashes and weeping, “ even they covet to themselves names of vanity, “ and glory in new and prophane titles.” And yet this name of vanity, this new and prophane title of Universal Bishop, was afterwards accepted by Boniface III. Bishop of Rome, when it was offered him by that bloody miscreant Phocas the Emperour; and the same title hath been owned by the succeeding bishops of the Roman church, and that as due to

* Greg. lib. 4, epist. 32.

them by divine right. Indeed, it may be questioned whether John of Constantinople, by assuming the title of Œcumenical bishop, meant that he had an universal jurisdiction over all other bishops and churches: but this is certain, that Gregory opposed the title under this notion; this appearing abundantly from his *Epistle to John the Patriarch; and it is as certain that under the same notion the Bishops of Rome afterwards assumed that title, and do claim it to this day. Nay, the *universal pastorship* and jurisdiction of the Roman bishop over all bishops and churches, is now no longer a mere court opinion, maintained only by the Pope's parasites and flatterers, but is become a part of the faith of the church of Rome; it being one of the articles of the Trent-Creed, to which all ecclesiasticks are sworn themselves, and which, by the same oath, they are obliged to teach the laity under their care and charge, as hereafter will appear. So that now there is no room for that distinction, wherewith some have soothed and pleased themselves, between the church and court of Rome; for the court is entered into the church of Rome, or rather the court and church of Rome are all one.

Sect. III. 2. The Church of Rome hath changed the *Primitive Canon*, or *Rule of Faith*, by adding new articles to it, as necessary to be believed in order to salvation: look to the Confession of Faith, according to the Council of Trent. It begins indeed,

* Lib. 4, epist. 38.

with the primitive Rule of Faith, as is explained by the Council of Nice and Constantinople ; and happy had it been for the Church of Christ if it had ended there. But there are added afterwards a many new articles, and with reference to them, as well as to the articles of the old Creed ; it concludes thus : “ This
 “ true Catholick faith, without which none can be
 “ saved, which I now willingly profess and unfeign-
 “ edly hold ; the same I promise, vow, and swear,
 “ by the help of God, most constantly to keep and
 “ confess, entire and inviolate, even to my last breath ;
 “ and to endeavour moreover, to the utmost of
 “ my power, that it may be kept, taught, and pro-
 “ fessed by all my subjects, or by those that are any
 “ way under my care. So help me God, and these
 “ his holy gospels.”

Now, if you examine those articles that follow the Constantinopolitan Creed, you will find they are not merely *explicatory* of any article or articles of the old canon of faith (such as that of *ὁμοούσιον* or same substance in the Nicene Confession, which was virtually contained in the ancient canon, and by good consequence deducible from it, and was apparently also the sense of the Catholick Church before the Nicene Council) ; but they are plain *additions* to the Rule of Faith. Now, if these articles were true, yet they ought not presently to be made a part of our Creed ; for every truth is not fundamental, nor every error damnable. We deny not but that general or provincial Councils may make constitutions concerning extra-fundamental verities, and oblige all

such as are under their jurisdiction to receive them, at least passively, so as not openly and contumaciously to oppose them. But to make any of these a part of the Creed, and to oblige all Christians under pain of damnation to receive and believe them, this is really to add to the Creed, and to change the ancient Canon or Rule of Faith. But, alas! these super-added articles of the *Trent Creed*, are so far from being certain truths, that they are most of them manifest untruths, yea, gross and dangerous errors. To make this appear, I shall not refuse the pains of examining some of the chief of them.

The first article I shall take notice of is this; “ I
“ profess, that in the Mass is offered to God, a true,
“ proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and
“ the dead; and that in the most holy Sacrament of
“ the *Eucharist*, there is truly, and really, and
“ substantially the body and blood, together with the
“ soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and
“ that there is wrought a conversion of the whole
“ substance of the bread into the body, and of the
“ whole substance of the wine into the blood, which
“ conversion the Catholick Church calls *Transub-*
“ *stantiation*.” Were this proposition, [*That in*
the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and
propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead,]
having that other of the *substantial presence of the*
body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist immediately annexed to it, the meaning of it must necessarily be this, that in the *Eucharist* the very body and blood of Christ are again offered up to God as a

propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men. Which is an impious proposition, derogatory to the one full satisfaction of Christ made by his death on the cross, and contrary to express Scripture, *Heb.* 7. and 27. and 9. and 12, 15, 26, 28, and 10, 12, 14. It is true the *Eucharist* is frequently called by the antient fathers, *πρόσφορα*, *θυσία*, an *oblation*, a *sacrifice*. But it is to be remembered, that they say also it is *θυσία λογική ἢ ἀναίμακτος*, a *reasonable sacrifice*, a *sacrifice without blood*: which, how can it be said to be, if therein the very blood of Christ were offered up to God?

They held the *Eucharist* to be a *commemorative* sacrifice, and so do we. This is the constant language of the antient liturgies, *We offer by way of commemoration*;* according to our Saviour's words when he ordained this holy rite, *Do this in commemoration of me*. In the *Eucharist*, then Christ is offered not *hypostatically* as the *Trent* fathers have determined, (for so he was but once offered) but *commemoratively* only: and this commemoration is made to God the Father, and is not a bare remembering, or putting ourselves in mind of him. For every sacrifice is directed to God, and the oblation therein made, whatsoever it be, hath him for its object, and not man. In the holy *Eucharist* therefore, we set before God the bread and wine, as *figures or images of the precious blood of Christ shed for us, and of his precious body* (they are the very words of

* Just. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 296, 297.

the *Clementine* liturgy), and plead to God the merit of his Son's sacrifice once offered on the cross for us sinners; and in this sacrament represented, beseeching him for the sake thereof to bestow his heavenly blessings on us.

To conclude this matter: the ancients held the *oblation* of the *Eucharist* to be answerable in some respects to the legal sacrifices; that is, they believed that our Blessed Saviour ordained the sacrament of the *Eucharist* as a rite of prayer and praise to God, instead of the manifold and bloody sacrifices of the law. That the *legal sacrifices* were rites to invoke God by, is evident from many texts of scripture, see especially 1 *Sam.* 7. 9. and 13. 12. *Ezra* 6. 10. *Prov.* 15. 8. And that they were also rites for praising and blessing God for his mercies, appears from 2. *Chron.* 29. 27. Instead, therefore, of slaying of beasts, and burning of incense, whereby they praised God, and called upon his name under the Old Testament; the Fathers, I say, believed our Saviour appointed this sacrament of bread and wine, as a rite whereby to give thanks and make supplication to his Father in his name. This you may see fully cleared and proved by the learned Mr. Mede, in his treatise intituled, *The Christian Sacrifice*. The *Eucharistical* sacrifice thus explained, is indeed λογικὴ θυσία, a *reasonable sacrifice*, widely different from that monstrous sacrifice of the Mass, taught in the Church of Rome

The other branch of the article is concerning *Transubstantiation*, wherein the Ecclesiastick professeth

upon his solemn oath his belief, that in the Eucharist *there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood of Christ.* A proposition that bids defiance to all the reason and sense of mankind. Nor (God be praised) hath it any ground or foundation in Divine Revelation. Nay, the text of Scripture on which the Church of Rome builds this article, duly considered, utterly subverts and overthrows it. She grounds it upon the words of the institution of the holy Sacrament by our Saviour, the same night wherein he was betrayed; when he took bread, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, *This is my body*, τὸ δίδόμενον, saith St. Luke, τὸ κλάμενον, saith St. Paul, *which is given and broken for you.* After the same manner he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, *Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament*, τὸ ἐκχυόμενον, *which is shed for many for the remission of sins.* Now whatsoever our Saviour said, was undoubtedly true: but these words could not be true in a proper sense; for our Saviour's body was not then given, or broken, but whole and inviolate; nor was there one drop of his blood yet shed. The words therefore must necessarily be understood in a figurative sense; and then, what becomes of the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*? The meaning of our Saviour is plainly this: What I now do, is a representation of my death and passion near approaching; and what I now do, do ye hereafter, do this in remembrance of me; let this be a standing, per-

petual ordinance in my Church to the end of the world; let my death be thus annunciated and shewn forth till I come to judgment. See 1 *Cor.* 11. 26.

As little foundation hath this doctrine of *Transubstantiation* in the antient Church, as appears sufficiently from what hath been already said concerning the notion then universally received of the *Eucharistical sacrifice*. It was then believed to be an ἀνάμνησις, or commemoration, by the symbols of bread and wine, of the body and blood of Christ, once offered up to God on the cross for our redemption; it could not therefore be then thought an offering up again to God of the very body and blood of Christ, substantially present under the appearance of bread and wine; for these two notions are inconsistent, and cannot stand together. The ancient doctors, yea, and liturgies of the Church, affirm the Eucharist to be *incruentum sacrificium*, a sacrifice without blood; which it cannot be said to be, if the very blood of Christ were therein present and offered up to God. In the Clementine liturgy, the bread and wine in the Eucharist are said to be *antitypæ*, correspondent types, figures and images of the precious body and blood of Christ. And divers others of the Fathers speak in the same plain language. *Vid. Greg. Naz. Apol. Orat. 1. tom. 1. Cyril. Hierosol. 5. Cat. Myst. Ambros. de Sacrament. lib. 4. cap. 4*

We are not ignorant, that the ancient Fathers generally teach, that the bread and wine in the *Eucharist*, by or upon the consecration of them, do become, and are made the *body and blood of Christ*.

But we know also, that though they do not all explain themselves in the same way, yet they do all declare their sense to be very dissonant from the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Some of the most ancient doctors of the Church, as Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, seem to have had this notion, that by, or upon the sacerdotal benediction, the spirit of Christ, or a divine virtue from Christ, descends upon the elements, and accompanies them to all worthy communicants, and that therefore they are said to be, and are the body and blood of Christ; the same divinity, which is hypostatically united to the body of Christ in Heaven, being virtually united to the elements of bread and wine on earth. Which also seems to be the meaning of all the ancient liturgies, in which it is prayed, *that God would send down his spirit upon the bread and wine in the Eucharist*. And this doubtless, is the meaning of Origen in his eighth book against Celsus, p. 399; [where speaking of the holy Eucharist he says, that therein “we eat bread by prayer (*i. e.* by the prayer of consecration for the descent of the divine spirit upon it) made a certain holy body, which also sanctifies those, who with a sound or sincere purpose of heart use it.”] but that neither Justin Martyr nor Irenæus, nor Origen ever dreamed of the Transubstantiation of the elements, is most evident. For Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, do both of them plainly affirm, that by eating and drinking the bread and wine in the Eucharist, *our bodies are nourished*, and that *the bread and wine are digested and turned into the substance of our bodies*;

which to affirm of the glorified body of Christ, were impious and blasphemous, and to affirm the same of the mere accidents of the bread and wine, would be very absurd and ridiculous. And Origen expressly saith, "That what we eat in the Eucharist is bread, but bread sanctified and made holy by prayer, and which by the divine virtue that accompanies it, sanctifieth all those who worthily receive it." He that would see more of this notion of the ancient Fathers, and particularly those places of Justin Martyr and Irenæus fully cleared and vindicated, from the forced and absurd glosses of the Romanists, may consult my learned friend, Mr. Grabe, in his Notes upon Justin Martyr's first Apology, of his own edition, p. 128, 129, but especially in his large and elaborate Annotation upon Irenæus, lib. 4. cap. 34.

I shall dismiss this article with this one only observation, that after the prodigious doctrine of Transubstantiation was confirmed by the first Lateran Council, there were many in the communion of the Church of Rome, who could not digest it, did not in truth believe it, and wished from their hearts that their Church had never defined it. For this we have the ample testimonies of very eminent writers of that Church. "The conversion of the bread and wine into Christ's body and blood," saith Cajetan, par. 3. qu. 75. article 1. "all of us do teach in words, but in deed many deny it, thinking nothing less. These are diversely divided one from another. For some by the conversion that

“ is in the Sacrament, understand nothing but iden-
 “ tity of place, that is, that the bread is therefore
 “ said to be made the body of Christ, because where
 “ the bread is, the body of Christ becomes present
 “ also. Others understand by the word *conversion*,
 “ nothing else but the order of succession, that is,
 “ that the body succeedeth and is under the veils of
 “ accidents, under which the bread, which they
 “ suppose to be annihilated, was before.” Occam,
Centilogii conclus. cap. 19, saith, “ There are three
 “ opinions about Transubstantiation, of which the
 “ first supposeth a conversion of the sacramental
 “ elements; the second the annihilation; the
 “ third affirmeth the bread to be in such manner
 “ transubstantiated into the body of Christ, that it
 “ is no way changed in substance, or substantially
 “ converted into Christ’s body, or doth cease to be,
 “ but only that the body of Christ in every part of
 “ it, becomes present in every part of the bread.”
Waldensis, tom. 2. de Sacram. Eucharistæ, cap. 19,
 reports out of Christopolitanus Zacharias his book,
 entituled *Quatuor unum*, “ That there were some,
 “ perhaps many, but hardly to be discerned and
 “ noted, who thought still as Berengarius did.”
 The same Waldensis, in the same book, cap. 64,
 saith, “ That some supposed the conversion that is
 “ in the Sacrament, to be, in that the bread and
 “ wine are assumed into the unity of Christ’s per-
 “ son; some thought it to be by way of impanation,
 “ and some by way of figurative and tropical appel-
 “ lation. The first and second of these opinions,

“ found the better entertainment in some men’s
“ minds, because they grant the essential presence
“ of Christ’s body and yet deny not the presence of
“ the bread still remaining, to sustain the appearing
“ accidents. These opinions he reports to have
“ been very acceptable to many, not without sighs,
“ wishing the church had decreed that men should
“ follow one of them.”

It cannot be doubted, but that there are at this day, many in the communion of the church of Rome, who are in the same perplexity about this article of Transubstantiation, and have the same wishes, that their church had never made it an article of their faith ; for the absurdities of transubstantiation, and the reason of mankind are still the same. Now what a lamentable condition are they in, who are forced to profess (yea, and all ecclesiastics now by the Trent confession in the most solemn manner to swear) that they believe what they cannot for their hearts believe ; whose consciences, between the determinations of their church, and the dictates of their own reason, yea, and sense too, are continually ground, as between two millstones ! I have been long upon this article, but shall be more brief on the next.

The next article is this : “ I confess also, that under one kind only, whole and entire Christ, and the whole sacrament is received.” Now this article of the *sufficiency of the sacrament of the Eucharist, taken only in one kind*, as it refers to, and is designed to justify the practice of the Roman

Church, in the constant and public administration of the sacrament to all the laity only in one kind, *viz.* the bread, denying them the cup, is manifestly against our Saviour's first institution of the sacrament, against apostolical practice, and the usage of the universal church of Christ for a thousand years, as is confessed by divers learned men of the Roman communion. And yet, according to the Trent Creed, all men are damned that do not assent to the insolent (and as I may justly term it) *anti-christian* decree of the Roman Church in this point. And who can without astonishment reflect on the stiffness and obstinacy, and uncharitableness of the Trent Fathers in this matter? Before they met, when it was noised, that a council should be called to redress the manifold abuses and corruptions that were in the church, it was the longing expectation, and earnest desire of many good men, that amongst other things, the communion in both kinds might be restored to the laity. There were a multitude of pious souls, as it were upon their knees before them, thirsting after the cup of blessing, and earnestly begging for an entire sacrament. But those *Duri Patres*, those hard-hearted fathers had no compassion on them, turned a deaf ear to their loud cries and supplications, only bidding them believe for the future (what they could not believe) that half the sacrament was every whit as good as the whole.

Immediately follows this article, " I firmly hold
" that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls de-
" tained there, are relieved by the prayers of the

“ faithful.” Now this article of a *Purgatory after this life*, as it is understood and taught by the Roman Church (that is, to be a place and state of misery and torment, whereinto many faithful souls go presently after death, and there remain till they are thoroughly purged from their dross, or delivered thence by masses, indulgences, &c.) is contrary to Scripture, and the sense of the Catholic church for at least the first *four centuries*, as I have at large proved in a Discourse concerning the *State of the Souls of Men in the Interval between Death and the Resurrection*: which I am ready to communicate to Monsieur de Meaux, if he shall desire it. Indeed the doctrine of *Purgatory* is not only an error, but a dangerous one too, which (I am verily persuaded) hath betrayed a multitude of souls into eternal perdition, who might have escaped hell, if they had not depended upon an after-game in Purgatory. But this article being very gainful to the Roman Clergy, must above others, be held fast, and constantly maintained and defended.

“ I firmly hold it.”

Prayers for the dead, as founded on the hypothesis of Purgatory (and we no otherwise reject them) fall together with it. The prayers for the dead used in the ancient Church (those I mean that were more properly prayers, i. e. either deprecations, or petitions) were of two sorts, either the common and general commemoration of all the faithful at the oblation of the holy Eucharist, or the particular pray-

ers used at the funerals of any of the faithful lately deceased.

The former respected their final absolution, and the consummation of their bliss at the Resurrection; like as that our Church useth both in the office for the communion, and in that for the burial of the dead: which indeed seems to be no more than what we daily pray for in that petition of the Lord's Prayer (if we rightly understand it), *Thy kingdom come*. The latter were also charitable omens, and good wishes of the faithful living, as it were accompanying the soul of the deceased to the joys of Paradise, of which they believed it already possessed, as the ancient author of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* in his last chapter of that book plainly informs us. In a word, let any understanding and unprejudiced person attentively observe the prayers for the dead in the most undoubtedly ancient Liturgies, especially those in the Clementine Liturgy, and those mentioned in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*; and he will be so far from believing the Roman Purgatory upon the account of those prayers, that he must needs see they make directly against it. For they all run (as even that Prayer for the Dead, which is unadvisedly left by the Romanists in their own canon of the Mass, as a testimony against themselves) in this form: *For all that are in peace or at rest in the Lord*. Now how can they be said to be in ~~peace~~ or at rest in the Lord, who are supposed to be in a state of misery and torment?

The next article is this; “As also that the Saints

“ reigning together with Christ, are to be venerated
“ and invoked, and that they offer up prayers to
“ God for us; and that their relicks are to be ve-
“ nered.” Now, for the *Worship and Invocation*
of Saints deceased, there is no ground or foundation
in the Holy Scriptures, no precept, no example.
Nay it is by evident consequence forbidden in the
prohibition of the worship and invocation of angels,
Col. 2. v. 18. with which text compare the 35th canon
of the Council of Laodicea, and the judgment of
the learned Father Theodoret concerning it, who
flourished shortly after that Council. He, in his
Notes upon that text of St. Paul, hath these express
words, *The Synod met at Laodicea in Phrygia made*
a law forbidding men to pray even to the Angels.
See also Zonaras upon the same canon. He, as well
as Theodoret long before him, rightly judged, that
both in the text of St. Paul, and in the Laodicean
canon, all prayers to Angels are forbidden. Now if
we must not pray to Angels, then much less may
we pray to Saints. The Angels are ministring spi-
rits, sent forth *to minister to them who shall be heirs*
of salvation: they watch over us, and are frequently
present with us, nay they are *internuncii*, messengers
between God and us, conveying God’s blessings to
us and our prayers to God, *Act. 19*, and *4 Apoc. 8*,
and *3*, none of which things are any where affirmed
of the deceased Saints. And yet we must not pray,
even to the Angels.

Hear also Origen who lived long before the Lao-
dicean Council, delivering the sense of the Church

of his time in this matter, *lib. 5, contra Cels. p. 233, edit. Cantab.* where he excellently discourseth against the religious worship and invocation of Angels; in opposition to which, he first lays down this as a received doctrine among all Catholic Christians, “That
“ all prayers, all supplications, deprecations and
“ thanksgivings, are to be offered to God the Lord
“ of all, by the chief high Priest, who is above all
“ Angels, the living Word, and God.” And presently after he shews the folly and unreasonableness of praying to Angels upon several accounts. As first, because the particular knowledge of Angels, and what offices they severally perform, is a secret which we cannot reach to; which is the very reason which St. Paul suggests in the text before-mentioned, that whosoever worships and invokes the Angels, doth *intrude into those things which he hath not seen*. From whence we may easily gather, that Origen in this discourse of his, had an eye to that text of St. Paul, and understood it as we do, to be a prohibition of all prayer to Angels. 2. He argues that if we should suppose that we could attain such particular knowledge of the Angels, yet it would not be lawful for us to pray to them, or any other, save to God the Lord of all, who alone is all sufficient, adundantly able to supply all our wants and necessities, through our Saviour Jesus Christ, the Son of God, his word, wisdom, and truth. Lastly, he reasons to this effect, that the best way to gain the good will of those blessed Spirits, is not to pray to them, but to imitate them by paying our devotions to God alone, as they

do. Hear the same Origen, lib. 8, p. 402, where to Celsus talking of those Spirits that preside over the affairs of men here below, who were thought to be appeased only by prayers to them in a barbarous language, he answers with derision, and tells him, he forgot with whom he had to do, and that he was speaking to Christians, *who pray to God alone through Jesus*. And then he adds, that the genuine Christians in their prayers to God, used no barbarous words, but prayed to him in the language of their respective countries, the Greek Christians in the Greek tongue, the Romans in the Roman language, as knowing that the God to whom they prayed, understood all tongues and languages, and heard and accepted their prayers in their several languages, as well as if they had addressed themselves to him in one and the same language. Again in the same book, p. 420, to Celsus discoursing much after the same rate, he gives this excellent answer: "The
" one God is to be atoned by us, the Lord of all,
" and must be entreated to be propitious to us, piety
" and prayers being the best means of appeasing
" him. And if Celsus would have others applied to
" after him, let him assure himself that as the body's
" motion unavoidably moves its shadow, so likewise
" when God is once become propitious to any, all
" his Angels, Souls, and Spirits, will become friends
" to such an one." From these testimonies of Origen, to which more might be added, it is very evident that the Catholic Christians of his time, made no prayers either to Angels or Saints, but di-

rected all their prayers to God, through the alone mediation of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Indeed, against the invocation of Angels and Saints, we have the concurrent testimonies of all the Catholic Fathers of the first three centuries at least. For as to that testimony of Justin Martyr, in his second (or rather first) Apology for the Christians, p. 56, alleged by Bellarmin, and others of his party, for the worshipping of Angels as practised in the primitive times of the Church; I have given a clear account of it, *Def. Fid. Nic.* § 2, c. 4. § 8, where I have evidently proved that place of Justin to be so far from giving any countenance to the religious worship of Angels, that it makes directly against it. And the like may be easily shewn of the other allegations of Bellarmin out of the primitive Fathers.

To conclude: look into the most antient Liturgies, as particularly that described in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, and the Clementine Liturgy, contained in the book, intituled the *Apostolical Constitutions*; and you will not find in them one prayer of any sort to Angels or Saints, no, not so much as an oblique prayer (as they term it), *i. e.* a prayer directed to God, that he would hear the intercession of Angels and Saints for us. And yet after all this, they are for ever damned by the Trent Creed, who do not hold and practise the invocation of the Saints deceased. For this is one of the articles of that Creed without the belief whereof, they tell us, *none can be saved*: that is, all are damned who pray unto God alone through Christ the Mediator, as the Scrip-

ture directs, and the Catholick Church of the first and best ages hath practised.

As to what follows, *that the Saints departed do offer up their prayers to God for us*; if it be understood of the intercession of the Saints in general, we deny it not. But this is no reason why we should pray to them to pray for us. Nay, on the contrary, if the deceased Saints do of their own accord, and out of their perfect charity pray for us, what need we be so solicitous to call upon them for their prayers, especially, when our reason and Scripture also tell us, that we are out of their hearing, and that they do not, cannot know our particular wants and necessities? For, as to what the Romanists tell us of the *glass of the Trinity*, and extraordinary *Revelations*, they are bold presumptuous conjectures, destitute of any ground or colour from reason or Scripture, and indeed are inconsistent with one another. To be sure, that conceit of the *glass of the Trinity*, would never have passed with the Fathers of the first ages: for they generally held, *that the souls of the righteous* (some indeed excepted of the souls of the martyrs) *do not presently after death ascend to the third heaven, but go to a place and state of inferior bliss and happiness* (which they commonly call by the name of Paradise, though where it is situated they do not all agree) *and there remain till the resurrection of their bodies; after which, they shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven, and there for ever enjoy that consummate bliss and happiness which consists in that clear vision of God, which*

the Holy Scripture calls seeing him face to face. And indeed, their distinction of Paradise (the receptacle of holy souls presently after death), from the third Heaven, seems to have firm ground in the New Testament. Vid. Luke, 23, 43, 2 Cor. 12, and 2, 3, 4, and *Grot. in loca*; and was undoubtedly received in the Church of God, before the coming of the Lord in the Flesh. However, this was a current doctrine in the Christian Church for many ages; till at length the Popish Council of Florence boldly determined the contrary, defining, *that those souls, which having contracted the blemish of sin, being either in their bodies, or out of them, purged from it, are presently received into Heaven, and there clearly behold God himself, one God in three Persons as he is.* This decree they craftily made, partly to establish the superstition of praying to Saints deceased, whom they would make us to believe to see and know all our necessities and concerns *in speculo Trinitatis*, as was said before, and so to be fit objects of our religious invocation, partly and chiefly to confirm the doctrine of Purgatory, and that the prayers of the ancient Church for the dead, might be thought to be founded upon a supposition that the souls of some, nay, most faithful persons after death, go into a place of grievous torment, out of which they may be delivered by the prayers, masses, and alms of the living. But this by the way.

It is added in the Creed, *that not only the Saints themselves, but also their Reliques are to be worshipped.* A strange definition of the Trent Fathers, es-

pecially if we consider the time when it was made; a time when the best and wisest men in the Roman Communion sadly complained of the vile cheat put upon the poor ignorant people, by shewing them I know not what reliques of Saints, and drawing them to the worship of them, only for gains sake, and to pick their pockets. Hear the judgment of the learned and pious Cassander, as to this article :—" Seeing
" there are a small number of true and approved
" reliques, especially in these provinces, and many
" of those which are made shew of, are too appa-
" rently liable to suspicion, and the frequenting and
" veneration of them is of little service to true piety
" and devotion, though of very much to supersti-
" tion or gain; it seems to me much more proper,
" that all such ostentation of miracles were forborn,
" and the people were invited to worship the true
" reliques of Saints; that is, the examples of piety
" and virtue they have left behind them for our imi-
" tation, as is recorded in what has been written
" either by them, or of them."

The next article of the Trent Creed, is this:—
" I most firmly assert, that the images of Christ,
" and the ever Virgin Mother of God, and other
" Saints, are to be had and retained, and that due
" honour and veneration are to be given them." A
doughty article indeed, worthy to be ushered in with
a *firmissimè assero*! But is this really an article of
the Catholick Christian Faith, without the belief
whereof there is no salvation? What then is become
again of the Catholick Church of the first three cen-

turies and downwards? For it is certain, that the Church of those days never allowed the use of images in her oratories or conventicles, much less the adoration and worship of them. This appears from what we read of Adrian the Roman Emperor, related by *Ælius Lampridius*, in the life of *Alexander Severus*, that he favouring the Christians, and willing to gratify them in their way of worship, commanded that they should have temples built for them without any images in them; as well knowing their utter aversion to the setting up of images in the places of their religious worship. This also more plainly appears from the writings of the Christian Apologists of those times against the Heathens objecting to them, that they had no images that they worshipped, and consequently, that they were Atheists, and worshipped no God at all; for they thought there could be no religious worship of any thing, without some visible image of the object to be worshipped; and finding no image at all, of any sort, in the oratories of the Christians, they concluded that the Christians worshipped no Deity. Now our Apologists are so far from pleading to this objection, that the Christians had no images in their places of worship, that they answer without any distinction, by way of concession, and that not only granting that they had no images, but affirming they ought not to have them, and condemned the Gentiles which had. See *Minutius Felix*, *Arnobius* and *Lactantius*.

In the fourth century indeed, there were some attempts to bring in pictures into the Christian orato-

ries, but they were presently checked and repressed by the governors of the Church, as appears from the 36th canon of the Council of Eliberis in Spain, and from the relation which Epiphanius gives us (who flourished towards the end of the fourth century), in his Epistle to John Bishop of Jerusalem, translated by St. Jerome out of Greek into Latin. *Tom. 2. Oper. Hieronymi*; where he tells John of Jerusalem, that going into a Church in the village of Anablatha to pray, he found there a picture hanging up, which (though it were out of his own Diocese), he cut in pieces, as being scandalous and contrary to the holy Scriptures; and desires John to take care for the future, that no such pictures be hung up in any Church under his jurisdiction. The words of Epiphanius are these: “ At my entrance into the Church to pray, I
“ saw there a veil hanging within the doors of the
“ same Church, died and painted, and having the
“ image as it were of Christ, or some Saint, for I
“ do not well remember whose it was. When there-
“ fore I had seen this image of a man hanging in
“ the Church of Christ, against the authority of the
“ Scriptures, I tore it in pieces, and advised the
“ keepers of the place to wrap therewith a poor dead
“ man, and carry him to burial in it. And whereas
“ they on the other hand murmured, saying that if
“ he would tear the veil, he ought in justice to
“ change it, and give them another for it: I no
“ sooner heard this, but I promised to give them
“ one, and that I would send it presently. How-
“ ever, some little time past, whilst I was seeking

“ after the best veil to send them it; for I thought I
 “ must send one from Cyprus. But now I have sent
 “ such as I could meet with; and I beseech thee,
 “ command the Presbyters of that place to receive
 “ the veil we have sent from the bearer, and to com-
 “ mand for the future, that no such veils as are con-
 “ trary to our religion, be hung up in the Church
 “ of Christ. For it becomes thy worth to have the
 “ greater care in this respect, that thou mayest take
 “ away all such scrupulosity as is unworthy of the
 “ Christian Church, and the people committed to
 “ thy charge.” The authority of this epistle is vin-
 dicated from the cavils of Bellarmin, by the learned
 Andrew Rivit, in his *Criticæ Sacr. Spec.* lib. 3, cap.
 29. How would the zeal of this great and good
 Bishop have been enflamed, if he had seen what we
 now a-days see, not only pictures, but massy ima-
 ges in churches, and people praying, kneeling, and
 burning incense before them!

By what means image worship in after-ages enter-
 ed into the church, is not so easy to tell; nor is it
 very necessary. But this is certain, that about the
 beginning of the eighth century it had gotten great
 ground. For in the year of our Lord 754, in the
 reign of Constantine, nick-named Copronymus, a
 general council was convened at Constantinople,
 consisting of 338 bishops, declaring itself the Seventh
 General Council. *Vide Syn. CP. in Act. Syn. Nic.*
 2, p. 621, edit. Col. an. 1618. This synod expressly
 condemned all worship of images, *decreeing it to be*
abominable; and that all images, of whatsoever mat-

ter or colour they were made, should be cast out of all Christian Churches. Ibid. p. 965. And presently after, they decree severe punishments to any man *that should dare from thence forward, to make, worship, or set up in the Church, or in his own house, any such image, as being a transgressor of the commandment of God, and an enemy to the doctrine of the fathers.* Where observe, that the bishops of this council condemn all image worship, as contrary both to Scripture, and also *to the doctrine of the fathers of the Church that were before them,* as indeed we have already shewn it to be. In this council, Germanus Bishop of Constantinople, Georgius Cyprius, and Damascene a monk, who were the chief sticklers for image worship, were excommunicated.

About thirty years after, *viz.* an. 787, another council met at Constantinople first, and was afterwards translated to Nice, in which the decree of the former Synod was exploded, and image worship first established in the Church. This council was called by the Empress Irene a bigotted image-worshipper. She had so great an influence upon this Synod, that partly by her persuasions, partly by her threatnings, several bishops who in the former Synod had condemned image worship, were now for it. Among these, Basilus Bishop of Ancyra, Theodorus Bishop of Myra, and Theodosius Bishop of Amorium, were brought in as *Pompæ Circences*, and offered to this council their letters supplicant, confessing that they had sinned in condemning the worship of images in the Synod

convened by Constantinus Copronymus. *Dux fœmina facti*. It was a woman that first brought this childish worship (the great Hincmar of Rhemes calls it *puparum cultum, baby-worship*) into the Church of Christ. The Bishops in the Synod, being destitute of Scripture proof and authentic tradition for their image worship; betook themselves * *to certain apocryphical and ridiculous stories*, as Charles the Great observed. For in this Synod, a letter from Adrian Bishop of Rome to Constantine and Irene, was produced and openly read, full of the most ridiculous fables, as particularly concerning the leprosy of Constantine the Great before his conversion; the barbarous remedy that he sought after by the blood of innocent babes; the appearing of St. Peter and St. Paul to him in a dream, advising him to send for Pope Sylvester, who, upon we know not what persecution raised by Constantine against the Christians, was fled with his Clergy to the Mountain Soracte, and there hid themselves in the caves thereof; that when Sylvester came to him, he commanded his Deacons to produce the images of St. Peter and Paul, which as soon as the Emperor saw, he cried out aloud, *These are the very images I saw in my dream; I am convinced, I believe, and desire the laver of Baptism*; which, when he had received, he was immediately cured of his leprosy; that, thereupon, in gratitude for the benefit he had received, he ordered Churches to be built for the Christians, whose walls and pillars should be adorned with the holy images of Christ

* Car. Mag. lib. 3. c. 3.

and the Saints. Was there ever such a legend offered to a synod of bishops? And yet this letter of Adrian was accepted and approved of by the whole council. Had none of them read the life of Constantine, written by Eusebius?

Wherefore, about seven years after, viz. an. 1794, this Nicene Synod was condemned and abdicated, by a council of about 300 bishops convened at Frankfort by Charles the Great, King of France. In this synod, were present not only the bishops of France, but also of Germany and Lombardy, as provinces subdued to the King of France. Pope Adrian also sent his legates thither, and the great Charles himself honoured this council with his presence.

The Romanists are hard put to it to ward the stroke of this council against the worshippers of images. They have several evasions. Genebrard * and Bellarmin † tell us that the fathers at Frankfort mistook the meaning of the 2d Nicene council, as thinking they had decreed, “*the worship due to God alone*,” to be given to the images of the saints, which they were very far from doing. But it is far more probable that Genebrard and Bellarmin were both grossly mistaken. There were assembled in this council almost all the learned bishops of the West; they had the acts of the 2d Nicene synod before them, and diligently perused them, and upon examination condemned them as to the point of image worship. Besides, our Alcuinous, the Emperor’s

* Lib. 3. an. 794.

† Lib. 2. de Imag. cap. 14.

tutor, the most learned man of that age, had before so fully examined the Nicene acts, that he wrote a learned discourse against them, and notably refuted them, as we shall hear by and by. Lastly, it is certain that the fathers of the council of Frankfort did not condemn only *cultum latricæ* to be given to images, but all manner of religious worship.

Others * therefore tell us, that they who urge the testimony of the Frankfort synod against image worship are utterly mistaken; that the synod which the fathers at Frankfort condemned was not the council of Nice, but that of Constantinople under Constantinus Copronymus; that the Frankfort synod perfectly agreed with the fathers of the Nicene council, and confirmed the worship of images. This is strange news indeed, but it is far from being true. The mistake of those writers who tell us this (if it were a mistake in them, and not a wilful prevarication) arose from hence, that the synod which established image worship, met first (as I noted before) at Constantinople, though it was afterwards translated to Nice; and so might be truly said to be a council convened at Constantinople, and thereupon be mistaken for that council of Constantinople, which was convened by Constantinus Copronymus, which was indeed confirmed by the Frankfort fathers. But that it was the second council of Nice, that was condemned by the synod at Frankfort, and

* Surius in adm. ad Lect. præ Syn. Frank. Coriolanus in Con. Frank. ad an. 794.

that upon this very account that it had introduced image worship into the church, we have abundant evidence.

For this is testified not only by Walfridus Strabo, but also by Ado Viennensis and Regino Pruniensi in their histories; with whom Abbas Uspergensis agrees in his chronicle, where he thus writes: “ In
“ the year 793, whilst Charles was celebrating the
“ feast of Easter, in France, a numerous synod of
“ bishops was gathered together out of all the pro-
“ vinces of the realm, the legates of Pope Adrian
“ were there also in his stead. In this synod the
“ heresy of a certain bishop named Felix was con-
“ demned. — The synod likewise which a few
“ years before met at Constantinople, under Irene
“ and Constantine her son, and was called the
“ seventh General Council, was universally renoun-
“ ced as useless, that so it might neither be stiled
“ the seventh, nor by any other name.” That the
council here said to be condemned, by the Frankfort
synod was the second council of Nice is evident, for
it is expressly said to be the council convened under
the Empress Irene and Constantine her son, and that
but a few years before. But it is said to be convened
at Constantinople because there indeed it first met, as
was noted before.

Add to this the testimony of Hincmar of Rhemes, an author in all respects most worthy of credit in this matter: “ * In the time of the Emperor Char-

* Cap. 20.

“ lemain, a General Synod was held in France by
 “ order of the Apostolic See; the said Emperor con-
 “ vening it. And according to the direction of the
 “ holy scriptures, and the tradition of the ancients,
 “ the Greek synod was condemned and wholly laid
 “ aside. Of the condemnation whereof a volume of
 “ no small size was sent from the same emperor to
 “ Rome by some of the bishops, and I myself have
 “ read it in the palace in my younger days.”

In the same chapter he afterwards adds, “ Where-
 “ fore by the authority of this synod the worship of
 “ images was somewhat restrained: yet not so, but
 “ that Adrian and the other bishops persevered in
 “ their opinion; and after the death of Charles,
 “ most earnestly promoted their puppet worship:
 “ insomuch that Lewis, Charles’s son, wrote a book,
 “ wherein he fell much sharper upon the worship of
 “ images, than his father had done.”

With what indignation and abhorrence the decree
 of the Nicene *pseudo-synod* was received by our
 British Church, our historians tell us. Hear Roger
 Hoveden. “ * Charles, King of France, sent the
 “ book of the council, directed to himself from Con-
 “ stantinople, into Britain †; in which book, alas!
 “ alas! many things were found unagreeable, and
 “ contrary to the true faith; especially, that by the
 “ unanimous assertion of almost all the Eastern
 “ doctors, that is to say, of no less than three hun-

* Part. I. Annal. ad ann. 792.

† Matth. West, ad ann. 793.

“dred or more bishops, the worship of images was
“confirmed: which the church of God utterly abo-
“minated. Against which, Alcuinus wrote an
“epistle wonderfully supported with authorities out
“of the holy scriptures, and brought it with the
“same book to the King of France, in the name of
“our bishops and princes.”

From whence it appears, that the Nicene acts sent from Constantinople to Charles the Great, were by him before the Frankfort synod first sent to Britain; and being examined, and abundantly refuted, and that from the holy scriptures, by our most learned Alcuinus, were carried back again, together with that refutation of them, to the emperor in the name of our bishops and princes: so that even *then*, the British church was Protestant in this article concerning image worship.

And indeed, I am persuaded that no man of judgment and integrity, that hath been conversant in the holy scriptures, and in the writings of the more ancient doctors of the church, will be able to read those acts of the *pseudo-synod* of Nice, without indignation and abhorrence of it, when he observes upon what ridiculous fables, gross misinterpretations of scripture, falsifications, and impertinent allegations of the ancient fathers, the bishops of that convention built their decree concerning image worship. Notwithstanding all this, the bishops at Trent chose to follow that wretched synod, and have decreed, and that as an article of faith, most firmly to be asserted, *that the images of Christ and the Saints are*

*to be retained, yea, and worshipped too. May not one presume to ask why? What necessity is there of this? Cannot the church of Christ be as well without these images, and this image worship now, as it was in the more ancient and purer times of it? Nay, may we not farther ask, what good use at all can be made of these images and this image worship? The answer of the Romanists here is, that these images are libri laicorum, et idiotarum, books fit to instruct the ignorant laity that cannot read the holy scriptures, and apt to raise devotion in them. But to this plea for image worship, made use of by Wading a jesuit of Antwerp, his learned antagonist returns this excellent answer, with which I shall conclude what I have to say upon this article: “ * I
 “ deny not but images may be of use to the stupid
 “ vulgar, who are led only by their senses, for rais-
 “ ing their devotion at the sight of them; but see,
 “ I pray thee, whether many more and greater dis-
 “ advantages are not to be feared from the use and
 “ worship of them. For in the first place, it is
 “ scarce possible but that the ignorant and prophane
 “ vulgar will be apt hence to imbibe filthy and sordid
 “ notions of God and the Saints, will depend upon
 “ these images and statues as their tutelar Gods, will
 “ pay them as bad or worse adoration than the hea-
 “ thens paid to their abominations; and, lastly,
 “ will grow mere brutes by using images instead of
 “ books, as if there were no need of understanding*

* Episcopii Resp. ad Epist. Pet. Wadingi de cultu. Imag.
cap 8.

“ more than these will teach them. This, were it
“ proper, might be abundantly confirmed : but I
“ only appeal to experience, as above all exception.
“ In the next place, it cannot be but the Jews must
“ be most intolerably scandalized at the use and
“ worship of images, and will be the more averse to
“ all thoughts of ever embracing of Christianity,
“ inasmuch as the worship of a statue or image, is a
“ dreadful, heinous, and enormous crime with them.
“ They most firmly believe, that he can never be the
“ Messiah, whose disciples allow as lawful what is so
“ directly contrary to the divine law. And this is
“ to be reckoned so much the greater evil, because it
“ is almost the principal occasion of all the Jews in-
“ dignation against Christ and Christians; so that
“ their conversion to our religion, is in my opinion
“ to be despaired of, unless this stumbling-block be
“ first taken out of the way. Thirdly, offence will
“ hereby be inevitably given to an infinite number of
“ Christians, and they will be irreconcilably alien-
“ ated from your Church, whilst having their minds
“ possessed with a true sense of the divine Prohibi-
“ tion, they think they have just reason to look upon
“ image worship as no better than idolatry : when
“ also at the same time, those that contend for it do
“ not believe it necessary by reason of any divine
“ command, yet nevertheless press it as much as in
“ them lies upon men’s consciences, as though it were
“ necessary. Who sees not what great evils and in-
“ conveniences these are ? The ignorant people are
“ tempted to continue in their prophane sottishness ;

“ the Jews in their destructive error ; Christians in
 “ their deplorable schism ; and all good men in an
 “ endless despair of ever seeing an amendment. So
 “ that I need not fear to make thyself the judge be-
 “ tween us ; and beg thee to tell me seriously,
 “ whether the single advantage of using and wor-
 “ shipping images will equal, not, to say preponde-
 “ rate, these so many and so great mischiefs.”

The next article is concerning Papal indulgences, in these words : “ I also affirm, that the power of
 “ granting indulgences was left by Christ to the
 “ church, and the use of them tends very much to
 “ the salvation of Christians.” Now the doctrine of indulgences, as it was before the Council of Trent, and hath been since taught in the church of Rome, is big with gross errors. It depends on the fiction of purgatory ; it supposeth a superfluity of the satisfactions of the saints ; which being jumbled together (*horreo referens*) with the merits and satisfaction of our Saviour, make up one treasury of the church ; that the Bishop of Rome keeps the key of it, as having the sole power of granting indulgences, either by himself immediately or by others commissioned from him : lastly, it very absurdly extends the effect of the power of the keys, left by Christ in his church, to men in the other world. Is not this now a doctrine worthy of a place in our cred, and to be made an article of the Catholick faith ? That the doctrine and use of indulgences were never heard of in the church of Christ for many hundreds of years, is certain, and confessed

too by divers learned men of the Roman communion. I shall cite only one of them, but be such a one as may be *instar omnium*. Our Roffensis, Luther's great antagonist, and Rome's martyr, gives us this account of indulgences: " * Many perhaps
" are tempted not to rely much upon indulgences,
" upon this consideration, that the use of them ap-
" pears to be new, and very lately known amongst
" Christians. To whom I answer, it is not very
" certain who was the first author of them. The
" doctrine of purgatory was rarely, if at all, heard
" of amongst the ancients. And to this very day,
" the Greeks believe it not. Nor was the belief either
" of purgatory or indulgences so necessary in the
" primitive church as it is now. So long as men
" were unconcerned about purgatory, nobody en-
" quired after indulgences: for upon that depends
" all the worth of indulgences. Take away purga-
" tory, and there is no more need of these. Seeing
" therefore purgatory was so lately known, and re-
" ceived in the universal church, who will wonder
" that in the first ages of Christianity, indulgences
" were not made use of?"

In this indeed the Bishop seems to be mistaken, that he thought the doctrine of purgatory and the use of indulgences to be coeval, and that the latter immediately and necessarily follows from the former. It is true, purgatory and papal indulgences are both of them later inventions. But I think, when men were first seduced to a belief of purgatory, they

* Act 12, cont. Lutherum.

were not yet presently so foolish, as to think that any one mortal man had power by his pardons to deliver men out of it. Anti-christianism in the Roman church did not presently come to that maturity, nor was the Papal power so soon advanced to that prodigious height and greatness. It was at first more reasonably judged, that the supposed miserable souls in purgatory, were to receive their relief, rather from the prayers of the church, together with the prayers, alms-deeds, and good works of their living friends and relations.

To sum up this matter in short: Papal indulgences, as taught and used in the church of Rome (to which this article of the Trent creed must have reference; or else let any man tell me, what the meaning of it is) if they were freely granted, can by no means be justified and defended, but the merchandize and sale of them for money is abominable. That such a vile trade of indulgences hath been driven in the church of Rome, cannot, without the greatest impudence, be denied, as long as the *Taxa Cancellariæ Apostolicæ* * is extant. Of which filthy book Espencæus, a learned doctor of the Roman communion, thus sadly and most justly complains in *Epist. ad Tit. c. 1*, “ There is exposed to sale, “ and easily to be had by any who will be at the “ charge of purchasing it, a book openly and publickly printed here, and which may be had now “ as well as formerly, entituled, *The Tax of the “ Apostolical Chamber or Chancery*, whereby may

* *Taxa Cancell. Apost. Paris. apud Tass. Denis. 1520.*

“ be learned more sorts of wickedness, than from
“ all the summists and the summaries of all vices,
“ and a licence for most of them, but an absolution
“ for all, is offered to such as will bid well for it.
“ I spare names, for as one, though at present I
“ cannot well recollect who, says, the very repeating
“ of them is offensive. It is wonderful that during
“ this time and this schism, such an infamous kind
“ of index of so many, such foul and horrid wickednesses, that I cannot imagine any more scandalous work is to be met with in Germany or Switzerland, or any of those countries that have withdrawn their obedience to the Papal see, should not have been suppressed. So far have the factors from the Roman communion been from suppressing it, that many new impunities for such so gross enormities are granted, and the rest confirmed in the faculties of the legates dispatched to their several countries.” A little after, * he adds out of Mantuan, “ It is sad to see how money carries all things at Rome.” And not very long before the Council of Trent, what a prodigious mass of money Pope Leo raised by these indulgences, the noble historian Thuanus† tells us:
“ Leo (saith he) to the guilt of his dispensations,
“ added another and greater, when at the instigation of the Cardinal Laurence Picus, he every
“ where exacted monies in vast sums, sending his

* Eccl. 9.

† Ad Ann. 1515.

“ bulls through all the kingdoms of Christendom,
 “ promising forgiveness of all their sins, and eter-
 “ nal life, at a price stated according to the quality
 “ of their crimes.”

In a word, all sober men cried shame at this abominable cheat, imposed on the souls of men for whom Christ died. And if the men that influenced and governed the Trent Convention, had had any true sense of religion, they would have denounced an anathema against this vile doctrine and practice, and not (as they have done) decreed, and that as an article of faith without any restriction or qualification, “ That the use of indulgences is highly conducing to the salvation of Christians.” But they were the Pope’s vassals, and received their instructions from Rome not to reform any thing, though never so much amiss, that tended to the grandeur and gain of that see.

The last article I shall take notice of is contained in these words: “ I acknowledge the holy Catholic and Apostolick Roman church to be the mother and mistress of all churches, and promise true obedience to the Pope of Rome, Successor to St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ.” Here the Ecclesiastick swears to three great untruths, one upon the neck of another. 1. *That the Roman church is the mother of all other churches*; which is a manifest falsehood in matter of fact. For every body knows that the church of Jerusalem was the first mother

church, and is so called and acknowledged by the ancient fathers. St. Jerome saith,* “ It was the church founded at Jerusalem, that planted all the other churches.” And the Synodical Letters from the Council of Constantinople to Damascus, and the Western bishops call Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem,† *which is the mother of all churches.* From this truly mother church divers other churches were planted in the East, before the Gospel came to Rome ; as particularly the church of Antioch,‡ where the disciples were first called Christians. Upon the persecution raised against the church of Jerusalem, the Christians of that church being dispersed and scattered abroad, soon spread the Gospel far and near through the East. And to come nearer home, it is affirmed by some learned men of the Roman church, that our Britain received the Gospel before Rome. For Suarez confesseth § that the Gospel was preached here from the first rising of it. And Baronius from some MSS. in the Vatican, affixeth our conversion to Christianity to the thirty-fifth year of our Lord, which was near nine years before the founding of the Roman church. But if the credit of these MSS. be questionable, this however is evident, that our Britain did not receive her first Christianity from Rome, but from the East. This, I say, is evident from the customs observed here from the

* Comment. in Isai. 2.

† Theodo. Hist. Eccle. l. 5. c. 9.

‡ Act. 11. 26.

§ Defens. Fid. Cath. l. 1.

beginning in the observation of Easter and the administration of Baptism, different from the Roman use, but conform to the Oriental churches. So that we may justly check the arrogance of the present Roman church in the words of St. Paul to the proud Corinthians, setting up among themselves certain customs, contrary to the institutes of all other Churches. * *Came the word of God out from you? Or came it to you only?* Q. d. Are you the first and only Christians? your church the first and only church of Christ? Yes, say the Romanists, our church is the mother of all other churches. But this is apparently false, *for the Law first came out of Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.* The church of Rome pretends also to be the only church of Christ, i. e. that there is no true church of Christ but what is in union with and subjection to her. But this is as false a claim as the other. For there were divers true churches of Christ, before the church of Rome was in being, which therefore could have no dependence upon her.

2. *That the church of Rome is the mistress of all other churches,* is another great untruth. A proposition which if it should have been advanced in the first ages of the church, would have startled all Christendom. Every metropolitical church would presently have stood up, and loudly pleaded her own immunities, rights and privileges independent upon Rome or any other metropolis. These rights and privileges were confirmed as of primitive and

* 1. Cor. 14. 36.

antient custom by the sixth canon of the great Council of Nice, as hath been before shewn; established also by the eighth canon of the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus, as by and by will appear. Indeed in the days of old, when the church of Rome was quite another thing from what now it is, all other churches upon several accounts, paid a singular respect to her, and gave her the pre-eminence; but they never acknowledged her mistressship over them, or themselves to be her serving-maids. This language would then have sounded very harsh, and been esteemed insolent and arrogant by all the churches of Christ. In later days indeed she hath made herself mistress, but, a mistress of misrule, disturbing the peace, invading the rights, and imposing upon the faith of other churches.

3. *That the Bishop of Rome is the Vicar of Christ, i. e.* under Christ the head and governor of the Universal church, is another gross untruth. The Universal pastorship and jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, over all other bishops, was never heard of, never pretended to by any bishop of that church for the first six hundred years and more, as I have before shewn. To which all that I shall now add, concerns our British Church. We say then, our church of Britain was never under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, for the first six hundred years; Britain being a distinct diocese of the Empire, and consequently having a primate of her own, independent upon any other primate or metropolitan. This appears first from the customs of our

church during that time, in the observation of Easter, and the administration of Baptism, different from, as was before observed, the Roman custom, but agreeing with the Asiatick churches. For it is altogether incredible, that the whole British church should so unanimously have dissented from Rome for so many hundred years together, if she had been subject to the jurisdiction of the Roman bishop, or that the Roman bishop all that time should suffer it, if he had had a patriarchal power over her.

2. The same is evident by the unanimous testimony of our historians, who tell us that when Austin the Monk came into Britain, as St. Gregory's Legate (which was after the sixth century was fully compleat and ended) and required submission from our church to the Bishop of Rome, as her patriarch, the proposal was rejected, as of a new and strange thing never heard of before. The answer of Dinotus, the learned Abbot of Bangor, in the name of all the Britons, is famous, *viz.* "That they knew no obedience due to him, whom they called the Pope; but the obedience of love, and that under God they were governed by the Bishop of Caerleon." Under God, *i. e.* immediately, without any foreign prelate or patriarch intervening, they were to be governed by the Bishop of Caerleon, as their only primate and patriarch. Which privilege continued to the succeeding bishops of that see for several ages, saving that the archiepiscopal chair was afterwards removed from Caerleon to St. David's. And that this was indeed the sense not only of

Dinothus, but of all the whole body of our British clergy at that time, all our historians tell us, witnessing the absolute and unanimous resolution of the British clergy, both bishops and priests, synodically met together, not to subject themselves to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. *Vide Spcl. Conc. Gual. Mon. lib. 2. cap. 12. Bedam omnesque alios.*

This being the antient privilege of the British church, we have an undoubted right of exemption from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, by the antient canons of the Catholick church: particularly by the sixth canon of the great Nicene Council above-mentioned, by which it was decreed, *That the antient customs should every where obtain, and that the then privileges of every province should be preserved inviolate.* But this is most evident from the eighth canon of the Council of Ephesus, occasioned by the famous case of the Cyprian bishops, which was this: the Metropolitan of Cyprus being dead (Troilus, the Bishop of Constance), the Bishop of Antioch pretended that it belonged to him to ordain their metropolitan, because Cyprus was within the civil jurisdiction of the diocese of Antioch. Upon this, the Cyprian bishops made their complaint to the General Council at Ephesus, grounding it upon the Nicene canon, and pleading that their metropolitan had been of antient time exempt from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Antioch, and was ordained by a synod of Cyprian bishops; which privilege was not only confirmed to them by the Ephesine Council, but a general de-

cree passed, *That the rights of every province should be preserved whole and inviolate, which it had of old, according to the antient custom.* And it is to be observed that the Bishop of Antioch had a more colourable pretence to a jurisdiction over the Cyprian bishops, than Gregory could have to a jurisdiction over our British churches: for Cyprus was indeed within the civil jurisdiction of Antioch, but our Britain was originally itself a distinct diocese of the empire. Yet the Ephesine Fathers judged, that antient custom should prevail in the case of the Cyprian bishops: how much more then should it in ours? Certainly Pope Gregory, when by his legate Austin, he challenged to himself a jurisdiction over our British church, was ignorant of, or had forgotten, or else regarded not the canons of the Nicene and Ephesine Councils. If it be objected, that our British church afterward submitted herself to the Bishop of Rome as her Patriarch, which power he enjoyed for many ages, and that therefore our first reformers cannot be excused from schism, in casting off that power which by so long a prescription he was possessed of; we answer, we did indeed yield ourselves to the Roman usurpation, but it was because we could not help it: we were at first forced, awed, and affrighted into this submission. For, who hath not heard of the barbarous massacre of the poor innocent Monks of Bangor, to the number of twelve hundred, for refusing Austin's proposal, and asserting the antient rights and privileges of the Britannick churches? When

this force ceased, and we were left to our liberty and freedom of resuming our primitive rights, why might we not do it, as we saw occasion, without the imputation of schism? This is not only our just plea, but it is ingenuously confessed by Father Barns our learned countryman, and of the Roman communion. His words are these: “*The island of
“ Britain anciently enjoyed the same privilege with
“ that of Cyprus, that is to say, of being in sub-
“ jection to the laws of no Patriarch: which pri-
“ vilege, though heretofore abolished by tumults
“ and force of war, yet being recovered by consent
“ of the whole kingdom, in Henry the Eighth’s
“ reign, seems for peace-sake most proper to be
“ retained, so it be done without breach of Catho-
“ lick unity, or incurring the charge of schism.”
Indeed, we had very great reason to resume our primitive right, and privilege of exemption from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, when by means thereof, he lorded it over our faith, and imposed manifest and gross corruptions both in doctrine and worship upon our consciences. But this by the way. We return to the article of the Trent Creed now before us.

Concerning which, it is farther to be observed, that it founds the Universal Pastorship of the Bishop of Rome upon a *divine right*. It says, the *Bishop of Rome is the Vicar of Jesus Christ; i. e.* under Christ the head and governor of the universal church. *Quo jure?* He is St. Peter’s Successor.

* Cath. Rom. Pacif. Sect. 3.

What then? Why St. Peter was constituted by Christ the Prince of the Apostles, *i. e.* (if there be any connexion of parts in the article) he had by Christ committed to him authority and jurisdiction over the rest of the Apostles, and consequently over the whole church.

But the falsehood and folly of this pretence hath been manifestly exposed by very many writers of our church :* particularly that great man Dr. Bramhall, Primate of Ireland, hath sufficiently refuted it in these few words. “ Let us consider,” saith he :

“ *First*, That all the twelve Apostles were equal
 “ in mission, equal in commission, equal in power,
 “ equal in honour, equal in all things, except pri-
 “ ority in order, without which no society can well
 “ subsist.

“ So much Bellarmin confesseth,† that by these
 “ words, *As my Father sent me, so send I you*, our
 “ Saviour endowed them with all the fulness of
 “ power that mortal men were capable of. And
 “ therefore no single Apostle had jurisdiction over
 “ the rest. *Equals have no power over each other* ;
 “ but the whole College of Apostles, to which the
 “ supreme managery of Ecclesiastical affairs did
 “ belong in common : Whether a new Apostle was
 “ to be ordained, or the office of Deaconship was
 “ to be erected ; or fit persons were to be delegated
 “ for the ordering of the church, as ‡ Peter and

* Davenant Determ. Q. 47.

† De Pont. lib. 4. cap. 22.

‡ Acts 1. c. 6. c. 8. c. 15. c. 11.

“ John, Judas and Silas ; or informations of great
“ moment were to be heard, as against Peter
“ himself? (though Peter out of modesty might
“ condescend, and submit to that to which he was
“ not obliged in duty ; yet it had not become the
“ other Apostles to sit as judges upon their superior,
“ placed over them by Christ;) or whether the
“ weightier questions, of the calling of the Gen-
“ tiles, and Circumcision, and the Law of Moses;
“ were to be determined? still we find the Supre-
“ macy in the College.

“ *Secondly*, That drowsy dream, that the plen-
“ tude of Ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction was
“ given by Christ to St. Peter, as to an ordinary
“ Pastor, to be derived from him to his successors,
“ but to the rest of the Apostles, as Delegates for
“ term of life, to die with themselves, as it is lately
“ and boldly asserted, without reason, without
“ authority either divine or human ; so it is most
“ repugnant to the doctrine of the Fathers, who
“ make all bishops to be the Vicars and Embassadors
“ of Christ, (not of the Pope) and Successors of
“ the Apostles, indifferently *Vicaria Ordinatione*,
“ who make but one Espiscopacy in the world,
“ whereof every bishop hath his share. St. Peter
“ was a Pastor, and the pastoral office is of perpe-
“ tual necessity in the church. True ; but so were
“ all the rest of the Apostles Pastors as well as he.
“ And if we examine the matter more narrowly, *cui*
“ *bono* ? For whose advantage was this distinction
“ devised? It was not for St. Peter's own advan-

“ tate, who setting aside his principality of order ;
 “ is confessed to have had but an equal share of
 “ power with his fellow Apostles, but for the Pope’s
 “ advantage, and the Roman Court’s whom they
 “ desire to invest solely with the key of all original
 “ jurisdiction.

“ And if we trace on this argument a little farther
 “ to search out how the Bishop of Rome comes to
 “ be St. Peter’s heir, *ex asse*, to the exclusion of his
 “ elder brother the Bishop of Antioch, they produce
 “ no authority that I have seen, but a blind, ill-
 “ grounded legend, out of a counterfeit Hegesippus,
 “ of St. Peter’s being about to leave Rome, and
 “ Christ’s meeting him upon the way, and admo-
 “ nishing him to return to Rome, where he must be
 “ crucified for his name ; which reason halts on both
 “ sides ; the foundation is apocryphal, and the su-
 “ perstructure is weak and unjointed, without any
 “ necessary connexion.”

We have now, I think, sufficiently made good our second charge against the Church of Rome, viz. *That she hath changed the Primitive Canon and Rule of Faith, by adding many new articles to it ; and those so far from being necessary Articles of Faith, that they are not truths, but manifestly erroneous propositions, repugnant to reason, Scripture, and the sense of the Primitive Catholick Church.* And yet all the Clergy of the Roman Communion are now forced not only to subscribe, but in the most solemn manner to swear to them. O miserably enslaved Clergy ! There was a time when the Gallican Church under-

stood her own liberty, and boldly asserted it, refusing to own the authority of the Trent Convention, as being altogether influenced and governed by the Court of Rome. It was a brave protestation of the Ambassador of France, made in the face of the Council of Trent, in the name of the King his master, and the French Clergy, in these words: * *We refuse to be subject to the command and disposition of Pius the Fourth; we reject, refuse, and condemn all the judgments, censures, and decrees of the said Pius. And although (most holy Fathers) your religion, life and learning, was ever, and ever shall be of great esteem with us; yet seeing indeed you do nothing, but all things are done at Rome rather than at Trent, and the things that are here published, are rather the Decrees of Pius the Fourth than of the Council of Trent; we denounce and protest here before you all, that whatsoever things are decreed and published in this Assembly, by the mere will and pleasure of Pius, neither the most Christian King will ever approve, nor the French Clergy ever acknowledge to be the Decrees of a General Council.*

I wish the Gallican Church had still persisted in this resolution: Yes, (saith a great man of our Church) so she did, and doth to this day. † [For though she doth not oppose the Council of Trent, but acquiesce, to avoid such disadvantages as must ensue thereupon, yet she did never admit it.] I should be heartily glad if this were true; but if all the

* Goldast. tom. 3. p. 571.

† Bramhall, tom. 1. p. 128.

Clergy of France, which represent the French Church, do as well as the Clergy of the other Roman Catholic dominions, subscribe and swear to the Trent Creed, (as I suppose they do ; and if they did not, I cannot see how they could be accounted within the communion of the Roman Church ;) then they admit of the Council of Trent with a witness, in its full extent and latitude, as to all its canons, decrees, and definitions, not only which concern points of doctrine (as is pretended), but all other which relate to the discipline and government of the Church. For this is the last article of the Trent Creed : “ More-
 “ over, what things soever else are delivered, defined,
 “ and declared by the sacred Canons and Œcumeni-
 “ cal Councils, and especially by the holy Council
 “ of Trent, I undoubtedly receive and profess.”

Sect. IV. 3. The third and last thing we charge the Church of Rome with, is, *That she hath lamentably corrupted the Primitive Liturgy and Form of Divine Worship.* This was a necessary consequent of the former ; so corrupt a faith could not but produce as corrupt a worship. To enumerate and represent in their proper colours, all the corruptions of the worship of God in the Roman Church would fill a large volume. I shall therefore only briefly point at some of them. The prayers of that Church are in a tongue generally not understood by the people, contrary to reason, which of itself dictates, that when we pray to God we ought to understand our own prayers ; contrary to the plain declaration of Scripture, 1 Cor. 14. contrary to the practice of the Ca-

tholick Church in the first ages, when Christians every where prayed to God in the language of their respective countries, as Origen expressly tells us in his eighth book against Celsus, p. 402. Justin Martyr also, who lived very near the Apostolick age, informs us, that in the Christian assemblies of his time, there were Κοινὰ Εὔχαι, Common Prayers, *i. e.* Prayers wherein all that were present, joined in common, and bore a part; and that (as we learn from other very ancient authors*), by making their *responses* aloud in due place, and by saying the other prayer after the Priest or Deacon, *submissâ voce*. Now there are no such Common Prayers in the Church of Rome, the Priests say and do all; the people being left to gaze about, or to whisper one to another, or to look upon their private manuals of devotion, according as their inclination leads them.

Again, whereas in the first and best ages, the Churches of Christ directed all their prayers, according to the Scripture, to God only through the alone mediation of Jesus Christ: the Liturgy of the present Church of Rome is interspersed with supplications and prayers to Angels and Saints, the unwarrantableness whereof I have above sufficiently shewn. To what is there said, I shall only add these two considerations.

1st. Supposing (not granting) the learned men of the Roman Church could by their subtle distinctions, so refine the practice of the invocation of Angels and Saints, as to make it innocent to themselves; yet

* Cyprian. Serm. de Oratione.

experience tells us, that the common people, who understand not those distinctions, are prone to transgress, and run into sin, and a grievous sin too, in their practice of it, *viz.* to be taken off in a great degree from that trust and affiance, that entire dependence on Christ, that love and gratitude toward him which they ought to have, and indeed to be more fond of the Saints than of their Saviour. It is visible to all men, with what zeal the silly deluded souls run to the shrines of the Saints, how even prodigal they are in their offerings to them, when in the mean time their devotion toward their Saviour is very cold, and their oblations to him sparing and niggardly. This is so manifest, that it hath been confessed by learned men of the Roman Communion. It is acknowledged by Biel, *in Can. Miss. Lect. 30, in Expos. Cant. Mariæ.* “Most of us are more affected towards some Saint, than towards our Lord himself.” By our Halensis, *Par. 4. Quæst. 26. Memb. 3.* “Sometimes sinners are more inclinable to supplicate the Saints, than the Judge.” Cassander also confesseth, there are men in the Church of Rome (otherwise no ill men), who trust in the patron Saints more than in Christ their Redeemer. His words are these: “There are some, and those no bad men neither, who have made choice of certain Saints for their patrons and guardians, and put more trust in their merits and intercession, than in the merits of Christ.”

2dly. Whereas it is pretended by some Romanists, especially of late, that their prayers to Saints amount

to no more than an *ora pro nobis*, a praying, or desiring them to pray for us, as we desire the prayers of one another here on earth ; this is manifestly false. For besides what hath been before observed, that they pray to Saints deceased, and in a state and place vastly distant from them, wherein they cannot possibly hear their prayers, unless by Revelation, or in *speculo Trinitatis*, which are groundless imaginations : I say besides this, divers of their greatest doctors ingenuously confess, yea, and boldly profess, that they pray to the Saints, as they are appointed by God, to be *canales gratiæ*, between him and us ;* conduit-pipes or instruments of conveying his grace to us. So our Halensis : “ Seeing the Divine Grace
 “ descends upon us by means of the Saints, it is but
 “ fit that our ascent to God be through their media-
 “ ation.” So their learned Archbishop of Florence:
 “ † It is the law of the Deity to raise the things be-
 “ low to those that are above, by those in the mid-
 “ dle ; but as to the gifts of Grace, the Saints stand
 “ in the middle betwixt God and such as are travel-
 “ ling towards him. Hence the divine benefits
 “ descend upon us by the mediation of Angels and
 “ holy souls.” They say also, that the Saints do procure for us, and convey to us God’s blessings by the merit of their intercession, and that this is the ground of their praying to them. So again *ubi supra* : “ The Saints are invoked by us by reason of

* Part 4. Quæst. 26. Art. 5.

† Part 3. tit 3.

“ our want of merit, that where our defects fail,
 “ those of others may help us out.” So the great
 master of the sentences, Peter Lombard : “ * We
 “ pray them to intercede for us, that is, that their
 “ merits may succour us.”

And indeed most of their prayers to the Saints are
 so expressed, that they cannot without violence be
 interpreted to any other sense.

But most extravagant is the invocation and worship
 of the blessed Virgin, used and practised in the
 Church of Rome. I will not urge here the Hymn
 in † Cassander's time sung in their Churches : “ Be-
 “ seech thy Mother, command thy Son, O happy
 “ Parent, who makest expiation for our wickedness,
 “ by thy authority as a mother command the Re-
 “ deemer.” Nor the Psalter of our Lady, mentioned
 also by Cassander, as that which was in use in his
 time, in which through the whole Book of Psalms,
 wheresoever the name of the Lord occurred it was
 changed into the name of our Lady. Though I
 know not whether those horrid blasphemies were
 ever censured and condemned by any public act of
 the Roman Church.

But I do affirm, that there are still such addresses
 and forms of Prayer to the blessed Virgin, either
 enjoyed, or allowed by authority to be used in the
 Church of Rome, as no man, who hath a due con-
 cern for the honour of his Redeemer, can read or

* Lib. 4. Dist. 45.

† Casand. Conc. art. 21, de Cult. sanct.

hear without abhorrence and detestation. Such is that, in the office of blessed Mary, where they thus speak to her: "Hail, Queen, the Mother of Mercy, our life, delight, and hope, hail; we shelter ourselves under thy protection, despise not our supplications in the times of our necessity; but deliver us from all dangers, thou ever glorious Virgin!" This is surely more than a *Pray for us*. For they pray unto her as their life and hope, and fly to her as their refuge and protection, beseeching her to deliver them always from all dangers: but chiefly it is to be remarked that she is here called the *Queen and Mother of Mercy*. Would you know the meaning of this? Berthorius* will tell you: "The truth is, whereas the kingdom of God consists in these two virtues, justice and mercy, God bestowed on Mary, the Queen of Paradise, the half part of his kingdom, that is, the Mercy. And for this cause it is, she is called the Mother of Mercy." The same exposition you may find in Biel.† And Cassander also acknowledgeth this to be the sense of that title given to the blessed Virgin.

In the Litany of our Lady published in English here among us, she is called, "Queen of Angels, Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles, Source of the Fountain of Grace, Refuge of Sinners, Comfort of the Afflicted, and Advocate of all Christians."

* Lib. 19. Moralitatum, cap. 4.

† In Canon. Missæ, Lect. 8.

Now we have no instance of such attributes given to the blessed Virgin, either in the holy Scriptures, or in the writings of the ancient Fathers; and indeed they are too big for any mere creature. For here the government of Heaven, and all the holy Angels therein, is attributed to her, which belongs only to our Lord Christ.* And what do they mean by that title which they give her of *Source* (Scaturigo) of the *Fountain of Grace*? I cannot imagine any other meaning of it, than this, that the Virgin Mary receiving first the emanation or efflux of Grace, from God the Fountain of Grace, by and through her, all Grace is carried and conveyed down to all the Faithful. And so indeed Bernardinus explains the matter in these words: “† No creature has obtained any Grace or Virtue from God, but by the dispensation of this pious Mother.” They that under this notion address themselves to the blessed Virgin, surely do much more than desire her to pray for them, as we desire the prayers of one another.

What do they mean when they say she is the Refuge of Sinners? From what hath been said before, concerning the kingdom of Mercy, supposed to be committed to the blessed Virgin, and concerning the title of Queen of Mercy given her, we may conclude the sense to be this, that when sinners are troubled in their consciences, and terrified with the sense of their sins, and of the judgments of God de-

* Ephes. 1. 20, 21, 22.

† Serm. 61. Art. 1. c. 28.

nounced against them, they may and ought to have recourse to her, as the Queen of Mercy, as their *asylum* and sanctuary to shelter and protect them from the divine vengeance. This, a credible author assures us, hath been represented in several Roman Catholic temples, in which Christ hath been painted with an angry menacing countenance, casting his darts against sinners, and the blessed Virgin interposing herself as mediatrix and repelling his darts. But Christ our Lord directs poor guilty sinners, whose consciences are oppressed with the burthen of their sins, to a far better refuge, yea, the only refuge they are to fly to, even to himself: *Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.* Matth. 11. 28.

And who can read without the greatest horror, such a prayer to the blessed Virgin as this that follows: *O my Lady, holy Mary, I recommend myself into thy blessed trust, and singular custody, and into the bosom of thy mercy, this night and evermore, and in the hour of my death, as also my soul and my body : and I yield unto thee all my hope and consolation, all my distress and miseries, my life and the end thereof, that by thy most holy intercession, and by thy merits, all my works may be directed according to thine and thy Son's will.* Amen. What fuller expressions can we use to declare our absolute affiance, trust and dependence on the eternal Son of God himself, than they here use in this recommendation to the Virgin? And who observes not that the will of the blessed Virgin is expressly

joined with the will of her Son, as the rule of our actions, and that so, as that her will is set in the first place? A smatch of their old blasphemous impiety, in advaucing the Mother above the Son, and giving her a commanding power over him. Yet this recommendation to the blessed Virgin, is to be seen in a Manuel of Prayers and Litanies printed at Antwerp, no longer ago than 1671, and that *permissu superiorum*, appointed to be used in the evening prayer for Friday. The book I had from a near relation of mine (who had been seduced to the Church of Rome, but afterwards returned again to the communion of the Church of England) who assured me, that she herself used it, by the direction of her confessor in her private devotions.

There was a book published (and that too *permissu superiorum*) and in great vogue among our English Catholics in the reign of King James the Second, entituled, *Contemplations of the Life and Glory of the holy Mary*. Wherein you may find these words; *God hath by a solemn covenant pronounced Mary to be the treasury of wisdom, grace and sanctity under Jesus. So that whatsoever gifts are bestowed upon us by Jesus, we receive them by the mediation of Mary: no one being gracious to Jesus who is not devoted to Mary, nor hath any one been specially confident of the patronage of Mary, who hath not through her received a special blessing from Jesus. Whence it is one great mark of the predestination of the elect, to be singularly devoted to Mary, since she hath a full power as a Mother, to obtain of Jesus*

*whatever he can ask of God the Father, and is comprehended within the sphere of man's predestination to glory, redemption from sin, and regeneration by grace. Neither hath any one petitioned Mary, who was refused by Jesus, nor trusted in Mary, and was abandoned by Jesus. Afterwards he tells us, p. 9. That though the condition of some great sinners may be so deplorable, that all the limited excellency, merits, and power of all the saints and angels, cannot effectually bend the mercies of Jesus to relieve them, yet such is the acceptableness of the Mother of Jesus to Jesus, that whosoever is under the verge of her protection, may confide in her intercessions to Jesus. There needs no comment to set forth the horridness of these assertions. Upon the whole matter, I cannot but think those silly women of Arabia, who once a year offered a cake in honour to the blessed Virgin as Queen of Heaven, to be as excusable at least as her devotees in the Church of Rome. *And yet they in their days were thought worthy of a place in the Catalogue of Hereticks. Sure I am most of the arguments Epiphanius useth against the Colliridians, may serve every whit as well against the Papists.*

To pass by the worship of Images, allowed and practised in the Church of Rome, of which I have said enough before,

Come we now to the principal part of the Christian worship, the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist.

* Hæres, 79.

How lamentably hath the Church of Rome vitiated the primitive institution of that most sacred rite! She hath taken from the laity, the blessed cup, contrary to our blessed Saviour's express command as expounded by the practice of the Apostles, and of the universal Church of Christ, for the first ten centuries, as hath been above observed.

All the learned advocates of the Roman Church, with all their sophistry, have not been able to defend her in this matter from manifest sacrilege, and a violation of the very essentials of the sacrament, as to the laity administered, nor can they prove it so administered, to be a perfect sacrament. He that would see this in a short compass fully proved, and all the weak evasions of the Romanists obviated, may consult our learned Bishop Davenant.* Besides, the whole administration of it is so clogged, so metaphORIZED and defaced by the addition of a multitude of ceremonies, and those some of them more becoming the stage, than the table of our Lord, that if the blessed Apostles were alive, and present at the celebration of the mass in the Roman church, they would be amazed, and wonder what the meaning of it was; sure I am, they would never own it to be that same ordinance which they left to the churches.

But the worst ceremony of all is the elevation of the Host, to be adored by the people, as very Christ himself under the appearance of bread, whole Christ, Θεὸς ὁληρῶς, God and Man, while they neglect the

* Determ. Quæst. 58.

old *sursum corda*, the lifting up of their hearts to Heaven, where whole Christ indeed is. A practice this is, which nothing can excuse from the grossest idolatry, but their gross stupidity, or rather infatuation, in thinking that a piece of bread can, by any means whatsoever, or howsoever consecrated and blessed, become their very God and Saviour. A very sad excuse indeed. Moreover, by what reason, by what Scripture, by what example or practice of the primitive churches, can the Romanists defend their carrying about the holy sacrament in procession, or the mockery of their solitary masses? I might pass from the holy Eucharist to the other sacrament of baptism, and expose the many strange ceremonies used in the Roman Church in the consecration of the font, and in the very administration of that sacrament. I might also take notice of the prayers used by the order of the Roman Church in the consecration or blessing of certain inanimate things, for the producing supernatural effects, such as curing diseases, driving away devils, &c. without any warrant from Scripture, or promise of God, that such effects shall follow. But I shall stop here.

I have now gone through the several heads of discourse, which I proposed to myself, and sufficiently I think proved that the Church of Rome hath altered the *primitive ecclesiastical government* ; changed the *primitive canon or rule of faith*, and lastly, miserably corrupted the *primitive liturgy*, and form of *divine worship*. For these reasons laid together, I can never be induced to enter into the communion of

the Roman church as now it is : and for the same reason (to speak my mind freely), I wonder how so learned a man as Monsieur de Meaux can with a good and quiet conscience continue in it.

Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.—Jer. 6. v. 16.

A P P E N D I X.

THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

After having recited the Nicene Creed, the following Articles are thus continued, viz.

13. I most firmly receive and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all the other observances and constitutions of the same church.

14. I do receive the Holy Scriptures in the same sense that holy mother church doth, and always hath, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of them ; neither will I receive and interpret them otherways than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.

15. I do also profess, that there are seven sacraments of the new law, truly and properly so called, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and necessary to the salvation of mankind, though not all of them to every one, viz. baptism, confirmation, the eucha-

rist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and marriage, and that they do confer grace; and that of these, baptism, confirmation, and orders, may not be repeated without sacrilege. I do also receive and admit the received and approved rites of the Catholick church, in the solemn administration of the abovesaid sacraments.

16. I do embrace and receive all and every thing that hath been defined and declared by the holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.

17. I do also profess, that in the mass there is offered a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a change made of the whole substance of bread into the body, and of the whole substance of wine into the blood; which change the Catholick church calls transubstantiation.

18. I confess also, that under one kind only, whole and entire Christ, and a true sacrament, is taken and received.

19. I do firmly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained, are relieved by the suffrages of the faithful.

20. I do likewise believe, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be worshipped and prayed unto, and that they do offer prayers unto God

for us, and that their relicks are to be had in veneration.

21. I do most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, and of the ever virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration ought to be given to them.

22. I do affirm, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the church, and that the use of them is very beneficial to Christian people.

23. I do acknowledge, the holy Catholick and Apostolick Roman church, to be the mother and mistress of all churches; and I do promise and swear true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, the Successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

24. I do also, without the least doubt, receive and profess all other things which have been delivered, defined and declared by the sacred canons and Œcumenical Councils, and especially by the holy Synod of Trent; and all things contrary thereunto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church, I do likewise condemn, reject, and anathematize. This true Catholick faith, without which no man can be saved, which at this time I freely profess, and truly embrace, I will be careful (by the help of God) that the same be retained, and firmly professed whole and inviolate as long as I live; and that as much as in me lies, that it be held, taught, and

preached by those under my power, and by such as I shall have charge over in my profession. I the said N. promise, vow, and swear: so help me God, and these his holy Gospels.

From a MS. in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth, No. 934, Article 71, indorsed:

Copy

Mr. Archdeacon's Bull's Lr.

Jan. 1705.

Sr,

'Tho' your last letter charges me with many hard things, yet I take it in good part; as coming from a person to whom I have very particular obligations, and whose good opinion I would not lightly forfeit. I hope none of my friends are so far changed in their thoughts of me, as to question my *sincerity* in what I have done; since I can assure you, I have no *interest* to serve thereby, nor any view or prospect of *advantage* from the *cause* I have espoused; being satisfied with what I have already, and having no encouragement given me to expect more.* And as I have not been influenced by any *private hopes*; so, I can assure you, I have not been *awed* by any *fear* from my *superiors*. For as I

* His friends had different views. He was, within a few months after the date of this letter, appointed to the see of St. David's.

had my archdeaconry without taking upon me any *obligations* to declare myself, so I have been left *intirely free* ever since, having neither been ask't by any one to speak out my mind, nor so much as invited to come up at the opening of the Convocation. So that how surprising soever my conduct may seem to some, I am not conscious to myself of having acted upon any *base* principles either of *hope* or *fear*. And since I have gone against the opinion of many of my *friends*, whose *esteem* has always been most *dear* to me; it ought to be an *argument* with them, that I have proceeded upon good grounds, and a full conviction of the justice of that side I have taken.

Give me, therefore, leave, Sr, to make some short reply to what I am charged with in your letter, as “*That I have declared myself overhastily, that I have not yet had any opportunity to have observed what the practices of the Lower House have been, and that I cannot yet be a competent judge of their proceedings.*” As to the charge of being *overhasty*; I think I have proceeded wth *wariness* and *caution* enough. The controversy has been so long on foot, that the world is tired with looking on: and *one side* (you know) had long the advantage of being *constantly heard* by me, whilst I was in Oxford, and some impressions were made upon me in favour of it; tho' I still suspended my judgment, 'till I should have opportunity and occasion to enquire into the merits of the *other* side.

I have lately made this inquiry wth impartiality

and strictness; sufficient, I think, to free me from ye charge of *overhastiness*. “ That I have not yet *had any opportunity to have observed what the practices of the Lower House have been,*” seems a little strange. The *practices* of both sides have been *lay’d open* to the world in *writing*, and one that has *cooly beheld* the contending partys may be allow’d to have made *some observations*. And it is chiefly from the observation I have made of the *temper* and *carriage* of *one* side, that I have been induced to declare for the *other*.

“ *That I cannot yet be a competent judge of the proceedings of the Lower House ;*” is a charge much of the same nature with the former, and altogether as strange. For *both sides* have long *appeal’d* to the world, and by that very *appeal* have allow’d others to be competent judges. It is not at all necessary that a man should be *actually present* at the *debates* of the House, to be able to judge of them: for when both sides have *publish’d* their claims, no doubt they have represented them as *fully* and as much to *advantage*, as when they were at *first debated*. And, I think, an *indifferent stander-by*, that has beheld the dispute, may in some respects be a more competent judge, than one that has been *long engaged* in it.

I see no reason, therefore, why my friends should be so much surprised at what I have done.

To send one’s proxy, is no unusual thing. And if at any time my proctor acts *contrary* or not *according* to my mind and intention, I can withdraw my

proxy when I please. At present I see no reason to do it: for as to the late protestation to which you find my name, I can truly say *that I have with grief observ'd for some years past*, the things complain'd of in that protestation. And I add, that it is a real trouble to me to see the unhappy dispute still *resolvedly* kept on foot by the Lower House, to the great prejudice of the church and religion, upon *claims* that at best are very *uncertain*, and such as, if they were *parted with*, the church would be as safe without them, and the great *scandal* that has been long given intirely removed thereby. And therefore I think it every good man's duty to contribute what he can towards putting an end to a dispute, that has given too much *advantage* against our *church*, to the *dissenters*, and against *religion itself* to the *profane*.

I did not design to trouble you with so long a letter as this, but I could not speak my mind in a less compass. And if what I have said may serve to set me right in the opinion of my friends, I shall be very glad. But if, after all, it be my misfortune to be thought ill of, I hope I am prepared to bear it; having govern'd myself in this affair by the strictest rules of conscience and integrity, which, I am perswaded, will keep me easy and undisturbed at any censures that shall be pass'd upon me.

I am,

Sr,

Yours, &c.

DR. HICKES'S

Account of the Purity of the Saxon Church to the Conquest. (Controv. Letters.)

“ The English Saxons kept the ancient apostolical faith pure and entire.* They had no other Creed, but the Apostles' Creed, and Nicene Creed, and that ascribed to St. Athanasius, as soon as it came to be used in the church. They constantly opposed the worship of images [See *Bishop Bull's Letter to the Bishop of Meaux*, p. 194.] and the intercession and invocation of Saints, after the second Council of Nice, and the doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ in the holy Eucharist, (afterwards called Transubstantiation), to the very Conquest.—They also had the holy Communion in both kinds to the time of the Conquest.”—Vol. II. p. 216.

DR. HICKES'S

Argument for the Safety of the Protestant Church in Preference to the Roman Catholick.

“ They say, by our confession some may be saved in their church, but say they, none can be saved in ours ; theirs therefore is the safer religion.”

* The “superstition, images, and idolatry,” introduced by Austin, and against which the Britons protested, the Saxons seem very soon to have rejected from their public worship.

Is he wise, that in the great cause of eternal life and salvation, will put his soul on a perplexed and perilous way, when he may go a plain and a safe one? By that argument should not every Papist turn Protestant, believe, worship, pray, come to service and sacrament with us? For

1. They confess with us *Scripture* is infallible, but we say, *not* the *Pope*; the Rule of *Faith*, say both; but not *tradition*, say we; safe to believe the *old Creed*, both grant; but a *new one*, we deny; to trust to *Christ's* merits, sure with both; but not to *ours*, with us; both believe *Heaven* and *Hell*, but we have no faith for *Purgatory*;—the Protestant's then is the safer faith.

2. And to worship *God* they say (with us) is safe and profitable piety; but to worship *images*, we say, is damnable idolatry; ours therefore is the safer worshipping.

3. And to pray to God in *Christ's name*, both grant good religion; but to call to *Saints* for help; or to God in their name, we say gross superstition; the former therefore is the safer praying.

4. And in the Sacrament of Eucharist a sacrifice *commemorative* both grant, but a *propitiatory* we disclaim; a *real presence* both allow, but the way of *Transubstantiation* we reject; the cup by *institution* we and they confess; a power of *alienation* we abhor; this therefore is the safer receiving.

5. Lastly, in our *Liturgy* is no error (some of them say), but in their *Missal* are many, say we;

service in a *known* tongue is not sinful (with them), but in an *unknown* tongue, unwarrantable and against Scripture, with us ; therefore it is best to come to our church service and prayer ; and so ours by their confession and reason is the best religion.

BISHOP JEWELL'S CHALLENGE.

“ If any learned man of our adversaries, or all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholick Doctor, or Father, or General Council, or Holy Scripture, or any example in the Primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved during the first six hundred years, (1.) That there was at any time any private masses in the world ; (2.) Or that there was any communion ministered unto the people under one hand ; (3.) Or that the people had their Common Prayer in a strange tongue that the people understood not ; (4.) Or that the Bishop of Rome was then called an Universal Bishop, or the head of the Universal Church ; (5.) Or that the people were then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporeally, casually or naturally in the Sacrament ; (6.) Or that the body is or may be in a thousand places or more at one time ; (7.) Or that the priest did then hold up the Sacrament over his head ; (8.) Or that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly

honours ; (9.) Or that the Sacrament was then, or now ought to be, hanged up under a canopy ; (10.) Or that in the Sacrament after the words of consecration there remained only the accidents and shews without the substance of bread and wine ; (11.) Or that then the priest divided the Sacrament into three parts, and afterwards received them himself alone ; (12.) Or that whosoever said the Sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ's body, had therefore been adjudged for an heretic ; (13.) Or that it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten or five masses said in the same Church in one day ; (14.) Or that images were then set up in the Churches to the intent the people might worship them ; (15.) Or that the Lay-people were then forbidden to read the word of God in their own tongue ; (16.) Or that it was then lawful for the priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely, or in private to himself ; (17.) Or that the priest had then authority to offer up Christ unto his father ; (18.) Or to communicate and receive the Sacrament for another, as they do ; (19.) Or to apply the virtue of Christ's death and passion to any man by means of the mass ; (20.) Or that it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people that mass, *ex opere operato*, (that is, even for that it is said or done) is able to remove any part of our sin ; (21.) Or that any Christian man called the Sacrament of the Lord, his God ; (22.) Or that the people were then taught to believe, that the body of Christ remaineth in the Sacrament, as

long as the accidents of bread and wine were without corruption; (23.) Or that a mouse or any other worm or beast, may eat the body of Christ, for so some of our adversaries have said and taught. (24.) Or that ever Christ said *hoc est Corpus meum*, the word *hoc* pointed not to the bread, but to an *Individuum vagum*, as some of them say; (25.) Or that the accidents or forms, or shews of bread and wine be the Sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself; (26.) Or that the Sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ, that lyeth hidden underneath it; (27.) Or that ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion;—the conclusion is, that I shall be content to yield and subscribe." *

EXTRACT FROM LESLIE'S LETTER TO
THE BISHOP OF MEAUX. (*Hickes's Letters, Vol. —. p. 313*).

"As God has appointed no universal Monarch, neither has he an universal Bishop. And all the arguments which an universal Bishop could use for unity and peace, and to end controversies, might be

* This challenge was answered by Harding. To his answer the Bishop published "a Replye unto M. Harding's Answer: by perusing whereof, the discreet and diligent reader may easily see the weake and unstable grounds of the Roman religion, which of late hath been accounted Catholike."

used by an universal Monarch ; and both prove equally fallacious, to the greater disturbance rather than settlement of that peace.

But as our faith is dearer to us than our lives, so the mischief would be greater, if the whole Church should be made to depend upon one ; for then *universa Ecclesia corruit, si unus universus cadit*. And if the Church falls, the faith which is built upon it, must fall with it."

**CERTAIN ACCUSATIONS BROUGHT RE-
CENTLY BY IRISH PAPISTS AGAINST
BRITISH AND IRISH PROTESTANTS
OF EVERY DENOMINATION,**

**EXAMINED BY
THOMAS KIPLING, D. D.**

DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.

INTRODUCTION.

SHOULD there, in a literary work, published by subscription, be contained certain parts injurious to religion, to morals, or to the reputation of some individual, the subscribers, if previous to the publication they were acquainted with its title only, and had no reason to suspect the principles and disposition of its author, seem not to be just objects of censure, on account of those offensive passages. But when several persons have contributed money for reprinting and republishing a work, which, in the days of their forefathers, had been exposed to sale, which, in all probability, without their pecuniary aid, would never have been again committed to the press, and the tendency of which is highly pernicious, those contributors unquestionably are censurable : and were we, from their patronage and support, to infer, that its contents are

throughout in unison with their own sentiments, we should not treat them wrongfully. They cannot plead ignorance ; neither will inattention excuse them. They might and they ought to have known, before they proffered their contributions, every thing advanced and every thing maintained in that volume.

A daring pamphleteer of the papal tribe, whose name was Thomas Ward, published, in the year 1688, a work entitled **ERRATA OF THE PROTESTANT BIBLE**. We are informed by his biographer, that not long after its appearance he was “ obliged to fly the country and go over to France.” Of the cause of his flight we are not informed. It is not improbable that he fled to evade justice. For, how innoxious soever his other publications may be, I am clearly of opinion, that, for his *Errata*, he was amenable to the law.

Yet hath his pestiferous tract been lately republished in Ireland ; and, from the editor’s advertisement, one would be led to conclude, that it is there held in the highest estimation. “ So great,” he says, “ has been his encouragement, that he has already” (before one copy of this new edition appeared in a bookseller’s shop) “ obtained a sale for more than two thousand copies.” An encouragement so vast, as seldom, I believe, if ever to be paralleled in the annals of literature. In the catalogue of subscribers it grieved me to read the names of so many members, both students and teachers, of the college at Maynooth. The countenance, which they have given this editor, so far, very far, in my judgment, from being a

proof of gratitude to the protestant king and parliament, by whose annual grants this popish seminary is supported, or of affection to that protestant government, under which all its members enjoy complete liberty, both civil and religious. But so totally dissimilar, not only in their complexions, but in their manners, are some classes of the human race, that possibly I am mistaken. I have a faint recollection of having read in some author, that there exists a species of animals, the young of which instinctively, after having been caressed with the most loving tenderness by their dam, and satiated with their milk, express their reciprocal love by assaulting her with their heels. But to return to the editor of Ward's Errata.

SECTION I.

THE EDITOR.

Ward says in his preface, that "the sole design of his treatise was to show the Christian reader, that those translations of the Bible, which the English protestant clergy had made, are in many places not only partial, but false, and disfigured with several corruptions." He did not however strictly confine his pen to this sole design. We meet in his treatise with some digressions. But nothing most assuredly has he advanced in it to counteract the baleful efforts of deists and infidels. Yet the publisher of this new edition has roundly affirmed in his advertisement, that this treatise is "an antidote to the principles of deism

and infidelity." The inference from this false assertion is, that this editor, when he penned his advertisement, had not read Ward's treatise and the preface to it, or else that he then knowingly contradicted Ward, and purposely misrepresented this author's subject in writing his treatise. Now, no evidence exists of a premeditated design in the editor to falsify and misrepresent Ward. Charity obliges us therefore to suppose, that, when he composed his eulogy on this publication, he had not perused it, and consequently did not know whether its contents were, what he affirmed them to be, beneficial to society, or had an adverse tendency.

What, it may be asked, should induce him to act in this manner,—thus to extol what he had no knowledge of, and ascribe to it qualities, which it does not possess? He seems to have had two objects in view; of which the primary was, to calumniate all protestants; the other, to evade the charge of wilful misrepresentation. That such was his primary object will be manifest from what follows.

"As nothing," says Ward, "has ever been worse resented by such as forsake God's holy church, than to hear themselves branded with the general title of heretics, so nothing has been ever more common among Catholics, than to stigmatize such with the same infamous character."* And it is true, that the illiberal practice of thus stigmatizing Protestants was very prevalent among papists for many gene-

* Errata, p. 22.

rations, and that this scurrilous appellation did excite resentment. But as the noise of a brasier's hammer, after having daily and almost incessantly for several weeks in succession dinned the auditory nerves of the neighbouring inhabitants, ceases in process of time to distract and molest them, so this term **HERETICK** by frequent application and long usage has now lost its poignancy, and excites in the present age not the least painful sensation. The Irish editor of Ward's Errata, sensible of this inefficacy, has fabricated new weapons, with which the feelings of Protestants may be assailed and wounded. In his life of Ward he represents this author as having been the offspring of parents, both of whom were Protestants, and educated by them himself in the same religious principles. In his advertisement this editor informs us, that Ward's "bright and transcendant genius was involved in his early days in the dark errors of infidelity;" artfully confounding infidelity and Protestantism, and applying them as terms perfectly synonymous. The reader will now understand, why this treatise of Ward, which is merely an attack upon Protestants, is called by its Irish editor "an antidote to the principles of deism and infidelity." He hopes, it should seem, that after these his precedents, other popish writers will use *Protestant* and *Infidel* promiscuously and indiscriminately; and that not many years hence every true Papist will bring against every Protestant this railing accusation—you are a deist; you are an infidel.

Against this solution perhaps it may be urged, that,

as deists and infidels reject the scriptures, and put no faith whatever in them, as Protestants make the scriptures their only rule of faith, and as every Papist must know, that such are the discordant sentiments of Deists and Protestants, and of Infidels and Protestants, it is not at all probable that any Popish writer should either himself be convinced, or hope to convince others, that *deist, infidel, protestant*, are terms of the same import. We grant, that it is impossible for any person, whilst he continues a Protestant, to be also a Deist or an Infidel; and it is further granted, that the Papists acknowledge this impossibility. But to infer that, because a thing is impossible, it is therefore incredible, is not to argue after the manner of a pure, genuine, unsophisticated Papist. Ask one of this species of beings* why he believes that the consecrated wafer, which retains the form, colour, brittleness, aridity, taste, and every other quality which it had before consecration, “contains really and substantially the body, blood, soul, and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the form and appearance of bread, and is perfect God and perfect man †,” his reply will be, “I be-

* These religionists constitute a class of Christians specifically different from all others. We have a notable specimen of this difference in one of their most literary characters. When he writes upon ancient architecture, or any other branch of human science, he reasons like a man of talents. When he treats upon miracles, or any other theological topic, he seems to be devoid of reason.

† “Q. What is the sacrament of the eucharist?

A. The eucharist is a sacrament, which contains really and substantially the body, blood, soul, and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the forms and appearance of bread and wine.

Q. What

lieve this, because it is impossible*." Impossibility is no obstacle to his faith. On the contrary, to

Q. What is at first put on the altar and in the chalice ? Is it not bread and wine ?

A. Yes : and it continues to be bread and wine till the priest pronounces the words of consecration.

Q. What influence have these words ?

A. The bread is changed into the body, and the wine is changed into the blood of our Lord.

Q. Does nothing of the bread and wine remain ?

A. Nothing of them remains except the forms.

Q. What do you call the forms of the bread and wine ?

A. That which appears to our senses, as colour, figure, and taste.

Q. Is there nothing under the form of bread except the body of our Lord ?

A. Besides his body there is his blood, his soul, and his divinity ; because all these are inseparable.

Q. And under the form of the wine ?

A. Jesus Christ is there entire, as under the form of the bread.

Q. When the forms of bread and wine are divided, is Jesus Christ divided ?

A. No : Jesus Christ remains entire under each part of the form divided.

Q. Say in a word what Jesus Christ gives us under each form.

A. All that he is : that is, perfect God, and perfect man.

Q. Must we worship the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the eucharist ?

A. Yes, undoubtedly : for this body and this blood are inseparably united to his divinity."—*A Catechism for the Use of all Churches in the French Empire, translated by D. Bogue. London, 1807.*—To this catechism is prefixed the present Bishop of Rome's bull, signifying his approbation of it, and attesting its conformity with the tenets of the Roman church. See also Concil. Trident. Sess. xiii. Can. 1, 2.

* Credo, quia impossibile.

believe what is impossible, he judges to be an act of superlative faith and piety, and to disbelieve it, because it is impossible, would be, in his opinion, impiously to question the omnipotence of the Deity. Such being his religious creed, and the Irish editor of Ward's Errata knowing it to be such, why should it be deemed improbable, that this man, in whose breast is implanted a deep-rooted hatred of Protestantism, should hope to impose so much upon papal credulity, as to instil into the mind of every genuine Papist a belief, that every Protestant is a deist or an infidel? But of the editor's maliciousness enough.

SECTION II.

ACCUSATIONS OF THE SUBSCRIBERS.

I now proceed to my chief object in writing this essay; which is, to handle the accusations brought by the subscribers to Ward's Errata against every Protestant in Great Britain and Ireland. I say *subscribers*; for I shall henceforth consider Ward's principles to be their principles, and the language, in which he calumniated protestants in his days, language applied by them to the protestants of our own time. The first publication of this treatise was the author's, the second is their act.

These accusations are,

1. That we protestant divines do obstinately teach contrary to our own consciences, and handle the scriptures impiously.*

* Errata, p. 21.

2. That bishops, priests, and deacons, being protestants, are without consecration, ordination, mission, succession, and pastoral jurisdiction.†

3. That all these and their flocks are guilty of sacrilege.†

The crimes here charged upon us protestant divines are all of a most atrocious nature; particularly the last. And being comprehended in it, as well as in the preceding ones, I feel it an obligation indispensably incumbent on me to undertake a vindication of myself. As in executing this duty an attack upon popery cannot be avoided, and being very unwilling to give offence to its votaries, I earnestly entreat those papists, who may chance to peruse this Essay, ever to keep in memory, that I have not taken arms against their characteristick tenets, till compelled to it by self-defence, “the eldest law of nature.”

SECTION III.

THE FIRST ACCUSATION EXAMINED.

1. In the first place it is imputed by those subscribers to myself and to all other divines of the protestant religion, inhabiting Great Britain and Ireland, that we obstinately teach contrary to our own consciences, and handle the Scriptures impiously. How are we to class this imputation? Among acts of loyalty? or among tokens of disaffection? The king of this united kingdom is by an act of the legislature

† Errata, p. 97.

supreme head of the church established in it. Therefore, the ministers of this church are servants of the crown. And they are all protestants. If this accusation then is groundless, the accusers have slandered their sovereign.

Whether this accusation is just or groundless, is a question to be decided, not by reasoning, but by facts; not by argument, but by evidence. But that, what we teach our flocks, we disbelieve ourselves, is an assertion, for the truth of which it is not possible to produce any evidence, unless we be such idiots, as openly to contradict in conversation or in print, what we teach in the pulpit. Do we then act in this foolish and wicked manner? If every protestant divine (and the charge is preferred without any exception) does thus contradict himself, this contradiction might any day be proved by thousands of facts. This accusation however is not supported even by a single witness even to a single fact.

In this total barrenness of facts and testimony recourse has been had to argument. It is asserted above, that this heavy accusation, the grounds of which are now under examination, is incapable of being proved by reasoning. The argument, by which the accusers have attempted to prove it, itself proves the folly of their attempt, and the truth of my assertion. "For," say they, "besides protestant divines having been reprov'd without amendment for their impious handling the holy Scripture, if their learning be so profound and bottomless, as themselves

proudly boast in all their works, we cannot but conclude, that they must needs both see their errors and know the truth. And therefore, though we cannot always cry out to them, and their followers, 'The blind lead the blind,' yet we may justly exclaim, 'Those, who see, lead the blind, till with themselves they fall into the ditch'*. This passage in the Errata being coupled with the charge, "That we teach contrary to our consciences," by the particle **FOR**, it evidently was intended to be a proof of this accusation. And it must be confessed, that in this clause, "besides protestant divines having been re-proved without amendment," there is something like a demonstration of obstinacy. But were this part of the accusation incontestably demonstrated, what could this avail, unless it be true, that we do teach contrary to our consciences? What is not done at all, cannot be an obstinate act. Do then the remaining clauses in the passage above quoted demonstrate the truth of this other part of the accusation, "That we teach contrary to our consciences?" Let us examine these clauses.

Is this an unquestionable position, that "every man of profound erudition must needs both see his errors and know the truth?" Newton, Locke, the first Lord Littleton, and Gilbert West were all of them laymen, and all lived and died in the protestant faith. Select the same number of persons from among popish writers equally eminent for their learning and probity, who were all of them laymen,

* Errata, p. 21.

and who all lived and died in the communion of the church of Rome. Now, so totally repugnant to each other are protestantism and popery, that one of these classes of literati must have professed an erroneous religion. But that either of them, had they seen their errors, and known the truth, would have adhered to the former, and disowned the latter on a death-bed, is a thing incredible. This position therefore is contradictory to experience, and false.

But admitting it to be true, is this a matter of certainty, that “every protestant divine, who both sees his errors and knows the truth, teaches contrary to his conscience?” If it be not true, and most evidently it is not, the argument which we are examining is no proof whatever, that we protestant divines do thus violate our consciences. To render this argument complete and conclusive, there is wanting in it this proposition, this *medius terminus*, “protestantism is erroneous and popery true.” But this is the point in question between protestants and papists. To have assumed it therefore in this argument as a truth, would have been in dialectical language “*petitio principii*,” in the vulgar tongue “begging the question;” which is contrary to the rules of logick. So that this argument is both defective and irremediably defective. And consequently the accusation, which it was designed to establish, neither has been, nor can be, by its means substantiated.

So many words having been spent in refuting a passage so glaringly absurd, an apology seems due to the reader. My excuse is this. The papists have

been hitherto utterly averse from perusing whatever has been written in defence of protestantism, and have read with avidity all the hostile attacks, which their own writers, however stupid and ignorant, have made upon it. My object in attempting to expose Ward's folly was, if possible, to weaken this inveterate prejudice. So long as it operates in its present vigour on the minds of papists, they must necessarily continue to believe, that there is no salvation for the souls of protestants, but that they all are at the dissolution of the body either annihilated or consigned to everlasting misery*. And whilst this notion is retained by the

* Ward, after having demonstrated, as he thought, that every protestant church is without pastors, asks, "Whether salvation can be had in a church without pastors?"—*Errata*, p. 97.

"No one can be saved out of the catholick church."—*Butler's Catechism*.

"Q. What do you understand by the words, I believe the church?"

A. That the church may always continue; that all, that it teaches, must be believed; and that, to obtain eternal life, we must live and die in its bosom.

Q. Why are these articles, The communion of saints, the remission of sins, and life everlasting, placed after this, I believe in the holy catholic church?

A. To show, that there is neither holiness, nor remission of sins, nor consequently any salvation or eternal life out of the catholic church."—*The French Catechism mentioned in page 245*.

N. B. In these extracts by the catholic church is meant the church of Rome.

"No salvation out of the church of Rome."—*Bull of Pope Pius V. issued in 1569 against Queen Elizabeth*.

"The Roman catholic church the only ark of salvation."—*The present Pope's Allocution delivered on Oct. 29. 1804*.

"This

Pope's ecclesiastical and spiritual subjects in Great Britain and Ireland, there can be no cordial union between them and the protestants.

SECTION IV.

PAPAL ASCENDANT.

It was in this uncharitable, unchristian, and contemptuous manner, that the West India planters were reported till lately to have looked upon their negro slaves. And there is too much reason for thinking, that, were the subjects of the Pope to acquire the ascendant in Great Britain and Ireland, whilst they entertain this degrading opinion of protestants, the condition of this latter class would soon resemble what was supposed to be formerly the hard lot of those Indian vassals. They would soon become "hewers of wood, and drawers of water," for papists.

Were any one to ask, why do you think thus? my reply would be, that generally speaking there is not a surer criterion of a man's inward disposition, than the language of his lips; for, "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh*;" that, whenever this language is seriously reproachful, it is an unerring mark; that we may collect therefore with cer-

"This true catholic faith, out of which there is no salvation, I do promise, vow, and swear, &c."—See *the Oath of a popish Priest in the Pontificale Rom.*

* Matth. xii. 34.

tainty, how the Pope's subjects in Ireland would then treat the protestants, from what they now say of them; that nothing more opprobrious can possibly be affirmed of protestant divines, than this, "that they obstinately teach contrary to their consciences, and handle the Scripture impiously;" and that a crime more atrocious than the sin of sacrilege cannot be alleged against any person.

Of what nature are the sentiments and dispositions of those persons, who subscribed to Ward's Errata, towards all sorts of protestants, it cannot be doubted. What more unequivocal proof can be given, than this wanton revival of Ward's coarse invectives is, of insolent contempt and rancorous enmity? And there is too much ground for apprehending, that several other papists may be found in Ireland, whose minds are tinctured with the same uncharitable sentiments, and whose breasts harbour the same inimical dispositions.

SECTION V.

INFERENCE FROM THE FIRST ACCUSATION.

The first accusation is, that we protestant divines obstinately teach contrary to our consciences, and handle the Scripture impiously. It has been observed above, that the ministers of the established church are servants of the king, and are all protestant divines. If this charge then were just, it would follow, that persons obstinately teaching contrary to their con-

sciences, and handling the Scripture impiously, are employed by his majesty to instruct his liege subjects in the principles of religion. But we have shown it to be groundless. Therefore the accusers have calumniated their sovereign.

SECTION VI.

A CAUTION.

Much has been lately said about certain concessions made at various times by the king and parliament to the papists in Ireland. Is a privilege to traduce protestants without cause and with impunity, among those parliamentary boons? Or is the recent practice of traducing us in this manner one of the pernicious effects only of those concessions? No declaration of this nature, that the ministers of the established church obstinately violate their consciences, are impious interpreters of Scripture, and guilty of sacrilege, had ever been openly made by a multitude of Irish papists previous to the year 1780. It must be therefore, either that such a privilege, as has been just now described, has since that period been granted by parliament, or that some other parliamentary concessions have emboldened those papists to attempt by calumnious untruths and abusive language to discredit the protestant clergy, and render them abominable in the eyes of their congregations*. Until the

* " The Catholics in Ireland will not disturb and weaken the protestant church establishment;—neither will they disturb and

Pope's authority shall have been abolished in Ireland, and the sentiments of the papists there respecting us protestants shall have been totally changed, let the legislature beware what other privilege it confers upon them.

SECTION VII.

WARD'S LOGICK.

Though I have already dwelt a considerable length of time on the extract above produced from Ward's Errata, yet I cannot finally quit it without first pointing out, what might otherwise escape the notice of a cursory reader, the singular method of reasoning adopted therein by the author. For the sake of illustration, imagine it to be the undertaking of some wiseacre to demonstrate, that the man in the moon is a negro. Should this demonstrator set out with proving, that the skin of the man in the moon is continuedly black from top to toe, and then proceed to demonstrate, that there is a man in the moon, he would exactly tread in Ward's steps. This ingenious writer has first attempted to show, that protestant divines, all of whom he had charged with teaching contrary to their consciences, commit this offence obstinately; and has next undertaken to prove, that they do teach contrary to their consciences.

I remember having often read in my younger days,

weaken the protestant government in this country." Dr. Troy's
Part. Instr., p. 101. 3d edit.

what logicians had written concerning what is termed by them a direct method of demonstration. I am now far advanced in life : but never, till dame Fortune in a propitious mood lately introduced me to Ward's Errata, had I met with an instance of this retrograde way of arguing.

SECTION VIII.

THE SECOND ACCUSATION.

Secondly, it is asserted, that bishops, priests, and deacons, being protestants, are without consecration, ordination, mission, succession, and pastoral jurisdiction. All the articles in this charge resting upon one and the same foundation, a separate discussion of each is wholly needless. By sapping and demolishing the foundation, all the parts of the superstructure will be overthrown together.

The ground-work, upon which the truth of every article depends, is, *mutatis mutandis*, the following *sortes* :

The Bishop of Rome was chief patriarch of the western church, and consequently of this nation, when Dr. Parker was appointed archbishop of Canterbury.

The chief patriarch of the western church, or some one authorized by him, can alone give pastoral jurisdiction to the primate of England, or to the primate of Ireland.

The primate of a nation, or some one authorised

by him, or his superior, can alone give pastoral jurisdiction to the metropolitan of a province.

The metropolitan of a province, or some one authorised by him, or his superior, can alone give pastoral jurisdiction to the bishop of a diocese within that province.

The bishop of a diocese, or some bishop commissioned from him, or his superior, can alone institute a pastor to a parish church within that diocese.

Dr. Parker, the first protestant primate in England, did not receive pastoral jurisdiction from the bishop of Rome.

Consequently neither this primate, nor any metropolitan consecrated by him, nor any bishop consecrated by such metropolitan, nor any pastor of a parish church instituted by such bishop, nor any succeeding primate, metropolitan, bishop, or parish priest, of the church established in England, from the time of archbishop Parker's consecration to the present moment, ever had, or now hath, pastoral jurisdiction.

SECTION IX.

THE POPE NOT PATRIARCH OF ENGLAND.

Now, by the established rules of logic, if of this species of argument, called *sorites*, any one of the premises is refuted, the conclusion will be thereby disproved. Let us examine then the first proposition in that chain, on which is suspended this second

* Errata, p. 97.

accusation. Was the bishop of Rome patriarch of this nation, when Dr. Parker was elevated to the see of Canterbury? That, prior to the accession of Henry VIII, the Pope of Rome had exercised the powers of such an office in England for more than four centuries, cannot be disputed. But, unless he was invested by a *divine* ordinance with those ecclesiastical and spiritual powers, he was justly bereft of his English patriarchy in the year 1534, it being then enacted by both houses of parliament, that “the king our sovereign lord, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed, the only supreme head in earth of the church of England.” The papists contend* that the bishop of Rome always had, and still hath, by *divine right*, a supremacy of spiritual and ecclesiastical authority, extending, not merely to England and the rest of the western church, but over all Christendom; and that therefore this decree of the British legislature being contradictory to the law of God, it was null and void at its very origin.

This tenet can boast a multitude of able advocates. But the latest of them being, I believe, the Rev. Dr. Troy, and this gentleman being held by all the Irish papists in the highest esteem and veneration, as well for his talents and learning, as for his piety and virtues, I shall venture to confine my inquiry to what he has published in favour of the Pope’s claim to universal supremacy. And should it appear, that his proofs and evidences do not clearly establish that divine right, on which it is wholly founded, I shall then

* Concil. Later. iv. cap. 5.

conclude, that this claim is a baseless fabrick. It is utterly improbable that of those arguments, which have been, or which can be produced in its behalf, even one argument of importance would be omitted by a writer of his sagacity, learning, and zeal for popery. If he has omitted some, (and unless I am mistaken, he has left out some arguments, which were formerly deemed important) these he undoubtedly has consigned to oblivion, because they in his opinion have already been refuted.

SECTION X.

IS THE POPE UNIVERSAL SOVEREIGN?

Dr. Troy's proofs and evidences are all comprised in the following extract from his writings.

“ It is a fundamental article of the Roman catholic faith, that the Pope, or bishop of Rome, as successor to St. Peter, prince of the apostles, in that see, enjoys by divine right a spiritual and ecclesiastical primacy, not only of honour and rank, but of real jurisdiction and authority, in the universal church. Roman catholicks conceive this point as clearly established in the Scriptures,* and by the constant tradition of the fathers in every age,† as it is by the

“ * Matth. xvi. 17, 18, 19. John xxi. 15, 16, 17. Ib. x. 16. Luke xx. 32. et alibi.

“ † Origen, Hom. 6. in Exod. S. Athan. Epist. ad Fel. Pap. Epiph. in Ancorat. circa init. Greg. Nazianz. de Mod. serv. in Disp. Chrysost. Hom. 55. in Matth. Cyril. lib. 2. cap. 1. in Jo.

express decisions of their general councils, which they consider as infallible authority in points of doctrine."†

This fundamental article is resolvable in the following articles, as its constituent parts. First, That St. Peter was Bishop of Rome. Secondly, that this apostle enjoyed by divine right a spiritual and ecclesiastical primacy of real jurisdiction and authority in the universal church. Thirdly, that this primacy of jurisdiction over all Christendom is inheritable, and

Theoph. in cap. 9. Lucæ. Tert. de Præscript. Hil. Com. in Matth. c. 16. Hier. in cap. 16 Matth. August. Serm. 201. tom. 5. col. 335. in Append. nov. edit. Idem, ib. Serm. 203. Max. Serm. 1. de S. Petro et Paulo. Paulin. Ep. 23. ad Sever. p. 149. edit. 1655. Leo. Serm. 2 de Anniv. Assumpt. Greg. Magn. lib. 6. epist. 37 ad Eulog. Iterum Epiph. in Ancorato. Chrysost. in Jo. Hom. 87. Ambros. in cap. ult. Lucæ. Leo Serm. 3. de Assumpt. sua. Greg. Magn. lib. 4. epist. 32. Theoph. in cap. ult. Jo. Bernard lib. 2 cap. 8 de Consid. Iterum Chrysost. Hom. 3. in Act. Apost. Gelasius in Tract. apud Labb, tom. 4. Concil. Col. 1215, et seq. All on the cited texts of Matth. John, and Luke. Vide Cl. Mamach. in Epist. ad Just Febr. Idem in Epist. sub nomine PISTI ALETHINI ad Auct. anon. et De l'Autorité des deux Puissances, tom. 2. édit. Strasbourg, 1788.

" † Concil. 2. generale, Constantinop. 1, Convocat. a Damaso Papa, anno 381, cont. Macedonium. Concil. Chalcedonen anno 431 Concil. Misen. 2. anno 787, act 2. apud Labb, tom. 7. Concil. Constantinop. 4. anno 869, act 1. Concil. 4. Lateran. anno 1215, can. 5. Concil. Lugdunen. 2. anno 1274. in Prof. Fidei Græc. Concil. Constantien. anno 1414. in Damnato. Wicklefii et Hus. Concil. Florent. anno 1449, in Decreto. Tandem Concil. Trident. annis 1545, et seq. Sess. 14. cap. 7"*

* A Pastoral Instruction, &c. addressed to the Roman Catholics of the Archdiocese of Dublin. By I. T. Troy, D. D., &c. 3d. edit. p. 31, 32.

radically inherent in the See of Rome. And should any one of these three articles prove to be false, it would incontrovertibly follow, that the spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction exercised by the bishops of Rome in any country whatever, where the sovereign and his subjects did not acknowledge the Pope's claim to universal supremacy, has been in all ages an usurped and unjust jurisdiction. For first, if St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome, no bishop of that see can have been his successor in it. And, according to Dr. Troy, unless the bishops of Rome were his successors in that see, none of them enjoyed by divine right an universal supremacy in the church of Christ. Or secondly, if St. Peter really was Bishop of Rome, unless he enjoyed by divine right a spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the universal church, his successors in that see cannot justly have enjoyed such a jurisdiction. For what this first bishop himself had not, his successors could not derive from him. Or lastly, supposing this apostle to have been Bishop of Rome, and that a primacy of jurisdiction in the whole Christian church had been conferred upon him by the head of the church, still, unless the grant was inheritable, and made inherent in the see of Rome for ever, the bishops of Rome had no more right to universal supremacy than the bishops of Antioch, or the bishops of any other diocese, and the exercise of papal authority in a protestant state must always have been unjust.

SECTION XI.

WAS PETER THE FIRST BISHOP OF ROME ?

I am thoroughly persuaded, that every one of those three articles is false. But as, by disproving the first only, this papal claim to sovereignty in all Christian countries will be sufficiently proved groundless, I shall not in this present essay proceed to refute any other article. The first is, that Peter was Bishop of Rome. Roman Catholics, Dr. Troy says, conceive this point to be clearly established in the Scripture, by the constant tradition of the fathers in every age, and by the express decisions of their general councils. My opinion is, that it cannot be established by arguments derived from any of these sources. Let us examine the arguments, to which Dr. Troy has referred us.

SECTION XII.

PROOFS FROM SCRIPTURE.

His proofs from Scripture are these :

“ And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou Simon Bar-jona ; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church ; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven : and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be

bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.*

“ So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord: thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith unto him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved, because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things: thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep.”†

“ And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring; and they shall hear my voice: and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.”‡

The doctor's next reference is to Luke, xx. 32. “ Last of all, the woman died also.” But he intended, I fancy, to refer his readers to this passage: “ And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not. And when thou art converted, strengthen thy

* Matth. xvi. 17, 18, 19.

† John, xxi. 15, 16, 17.

‡ John, x. 16.

brethren :”* these words of our Lord having often been dragged into this controversy by the advocates for popery.

To the doctor’s last proof from Scripture his readers are referred in this manner—*et alibi*. Where this other proof is, I cannot conjecture.† But

* Luke, xxii. 31, 32.

† I would venture to affirm, if the truth could be known, that this titular archbishop annexed to the word *alibi*, that very idea which other writers on similar occasions have expressed by the adverb *passim*.

This archbishop has quoted the following sentence from Irenæus: “Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potio- rem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos, qui sunt undique fideles.” Irenæus, perceiving that this expression, “*omnem convenire ecclesiam*,” was of ambiguous meaning, immediately therefore subjoined this explanation—“hoc est, eos, qui sunt undique fideles;” and also added, what his lordship has not brought forward,” in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea, quæ est ab apostolis, traditio.” The church of Rome was then, as it is now, the principal church in Italy. And it is of this church, that Irenæus is here speaking. By “eos, qui sunt undique fideles,” he evidently meant those persons only, who, professing Christianity, inhabited the circumjacent and surrounding country. He has repeated the word “undique.” “Ubique” occurs not either in this sentence or in its context.

Thus much being premised, I shall now lay before the reader archbishop Troy’s translation of Irenæus’s words. “The apostolic holy see, the root of all other churches,” says he, “to which Irenæus, a father of the second century, declares *every* church, and *all* the faithful should have recourse, on account of her greater eminence or principality.” “*Omnis ecclesia*,” had it not been for the exposition, which Irenæus himself has given, might indeed have been interpreted to mean “*every* church.”

wherever it is, and whatever it may be, I scruple not to affirm, that should any one attempt by extracts from his Bible to show, that St. Peter was bishop of Rome, he would just as profitably be employed in labouring to extract water out of a pumice-stone, or sun-beams out of cucumbers. That the four quotations, which I have transcribed above, do not “clearly” or confusedly “establish this point,” must be evident to every reader in his majesty’s dominions. The words **ROME** and **BISHOP** nowhere occur in them; and I add, that as they do not establish this first article, so neither do they prove the second, that St. Peter was invested with universal sovereignty; nor consequently the third, that he bequeathed such a sovereignty to the bishops of Rome.

But this exposition, “*eos, qui sunt undique, fideles,*” puts the matter out of all doubt. Yet these words, which can denote only, “all the faithful round about Rome,” the archbishop has chosen to render “all the faithful;” that is, the faithful everywhere, the faithful in all countries. It being evident therefore that his lordship is unacquainted with the difference between “undique,” and “ubique,” I am warranted in my conjecture, that he is ignorant of the difference between “alibi,” and “passim.”

This quotation is produced by the archbishop to prove, that the Popes of Rome, in Irenæus’s time, “enjoyed in all spiritual and ecclesiastical concerns an *universal* and supreme jurisdiction.”—*Past. Instr.*, p. 90, 92. His lordship may now learn, that it no more establishes this point, than it demonstrates, that “the dominions of *Golbasto Momaren Exlame Gurdilo Shefn Mully Ully Gue*, most mighty emperor of *Lilliput*, extended five thousand *blustrugs* to the extremities of the globe.”

SECTION XIII.

PROOFS FROM THE FATHERS.

Another source, to which Dr. Troy has resorted for arguments, is "the constant tradition of the fathers in every age." In my examination of his proofs from Scripture I transcribed at full length the passages, to which he has made references, that the reader might form his own judgment concerning them. I wish it were in my power to continue this practice. In his references to the sacred writings he has specified chapter and verse. But in pointing out the places where those proofs and evidences are, with which the fathers and general councils have supplied him, he has assumed a most enormous latitude. The minutes of the council held at Chalcedon in 451 (not 431), if they were edited in a splendid manner, would form a large quarto volume. Yet hath this author referred us, not to a particular act or session, but to the whole mass. "Vide," says he, "Concil. Chalcedonen. anno 431." In this manner hath he also appealed to the writings of the fathers; not to a certain page, or paragraph, or section, or chapter, but to entire homilies, entire discourses, and entire treatises of considerable length. Under such circumstances it is impossible for me to do more, than, where no ground for doubt exists, to make a faithful report, and, where there may be doubt, to make a faithful transcript of

the dubious passage for the reader's perusal and deliberation.

“ Roman catholics,” says Dr. Troy, “ conceive this point, that the bishop of Rome is successor to St. Peter in that see, to be clearly established by the constant tradition of the fathers in every age.” The word *age* has a variety of meanings. In its most extensive acceptation it signifies a century. And this I conceive to be the sense, in which Dr. Troy intended it to be here taken. On this supposition the doctor's assertion is, that in every one of the early centuries there flourished, if not several ecclesiastical authors, at least some one, by whose writings now extant it may clearly be established, that St. Peter was bishop of Rome. Nothing short of this could he possibly have meant to affirm.

The doctor has appealed in support of this assertion to twenty-eight literary compositions. But against his three appeals to the writings of Mamachi I must enter my protest. This author, as Dr. Troy informs us, published his “ *De l'Autorité des Deux Puissances*” in 1788. He cannot therefore be justly styled a father of any age; nor can any evidence of his be of the least weight in the present controversy. I might also take exception to Theophylact and Bernard, the former being a writer of the eleventh, and the latter of the twelfth century. Neither are the tracts, which the doctor has ascribed to Athanasius and Augustine, unexceptionable evidences. The Epistle to Pope Felix, to which Dr. Troy has referred us, as being written by

Athanasius, is a spurious composition: and the *Ser* 201, 203, to which we are referred, as being composed by Augustine, have been cast by this author and latest editors into a receptacle for anonymous, counterfeit, and supposititious tracts. What could induce Dr. Troy to cull testimonies from such a *trago*? But I mean to act liberally throughout this inquiry; and for the present will admit, that all works, except those of Mamachius, to which Dr. Troy has made references under this head, are genuine and sufficiently ancient.

Of the twenty-five compositions, which I add to be good evidences, twenty-two contain no proof that Peter was bishop of Rome. Such is my report where no ground for doubt exists. Respecting the true meaning of the three other testimonies, there may be a difference of opinion. Of these, therefore, agreeably to my promise, I shall now give faithful transcripts.

SECTION XIV.

DUBIOUS PROOFS FROM THE FATHERS.

The most ancient of those doubtful testimonies are the second and third discourses delivered by Pope Leo on his own assumption. Leo was consecrated Pope in 440. St. Peter suffered martyrdom about the year 64; that is, about 376 years before Leo entered upon the papal office. According to Dr. Troy the fact, that Peter was bishop of Rome

“clearly established by the constant tradition of the fathers in every age.” Yet the earliest evidence of this fact, which he has produced, is that of a person, who had no existence in this life until Peter had ceased to exist in it upwards of three hundred years.

St. Peter's assumption of the episcopal office at Rome, and of sovereign authority over all Christendom, could not be an obscure act, but must have been matter of public notoriety, at least among all Christians. It was not an insignificant and inconsiderable event (if it did happen), but most important in its consequences, every subsequent bishop of Rome being to derive from Peter, as his successor in that see, universal sovereignty. Is it not strange therefore, that Dr. Troy, enumerating the proofs and evidences, on which Roman catholics have founded their belief of this important fact, should not have adduced even one evidence of it prior to the fifth century? If it was unknown to all the ecclesiastical writers of the first four centuries, how did Pope Leo, who lived in the fifth, acquire his knowledge of it? The number of those writers is immense.* And Peter is repeatedly mentioned by very many of them.

It must, however, be confessed, that there are still extant some records older than Leo's orations, in which it is said, that Peter was bishop of Rome. But the authors of them, I believe, derived their information from the following imposture.

* See Cave's Hist. Liter.

SECTION XV.

A FORGERY OF HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS.

In Eusebius's Chronological Tables, written originally in Greek, is this record: "Peter, the chief of the apostles, having founded the first church in Antioch, departs thence for Rome to preach the gospel.*" These Tables were translated by Jerome for the use of the western churches, out of the Greek into the Latin tongue. The record in this Latin version corresponding to that, of which I have given a transcript from the Greek original, is in English thus: "In the year XLIII. Peter the apostle, when he, before any other person, had founded a church at Antioch, is sent to Rome; where he continues bishop of that city, preaching the gospel twenty-five years.†" It does not appear from the original of Eusebius that Peter ever arrived at Rome. Yet Jerome has added, not merely that he arrived there, but that he continued to be bishop of that city twenty-five years. This addition is a forgery.

It cannot justly be urged in vindication of Jerome, that through the carelessness and oscitancy of some early transcriber, the corresponding Greek of Euse-

* Πέτρος ὁ κορυφαῖος τὴν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ πρώτην θεμελιώσας ἐκκλησίαν εἰς Ῥώμην ἀπεισι κηρυττῶν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον,—*Eusebii Canonis christiani, ad an. XLIII.*

† A. D. XLIII Petrus apostolus, quum primus Antiochenam ecclesiam fundasset, Romam mittitur; ubi evangelium prædicans XXV annis ejusdem urbis episcopus perseverat.

Euseb. Chron. ab Hieronymo Latine reddit.

bis has, perhaps, been lost. That this cannot be justly pleaded, will be evident from what follows. Dr. Blair, about nineteen years ago, published a complete set of Chronological Tables. Had this chronologist undertaken afterwards to write a history of England, and taken for the heads of this posterior work those brief memoranda in his Tables, which relate to this country, could he have omitted in it the reign of Queen Elizabeth, or any other entire reign? Manifestly not. Now, the Canon Chronicus, or Chronological Tables, of Eusebius, is one of his earliest publications. Another work of the same author, and of later date than the Canon, is his History of the Christian Church, extending from the nativity of Christ to the year of the Christian æra CCCXXV. In the beginning of this history, Eusebius has told his readers, that of those events, which aforetime had been registered by him briefly and compendiously in his Canon Chronicus, he should now give a more copious narrative.* The contents of his Canon are the heads, as it were, of his History. Suppose now, that in the former work he had recorded, as Jerome has done, that Peter was bishop of Rome twenty-five years; would he afterwards, in his History, have been totally silent about this long episcopate of Peter? It is mentioned in his History, that Peter in conjunction with

* Ἡδὴ μὲν οὖν τούτων καὶ προτέρων ἐν αἷς διετυπωσάμενη χρονικοῖς περὶ αὐτῶν, ἐπιτομὴν κατεγέγραφα. πληρεστάτην δ' οὖν ὁμῶς αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῶν παρόντων ἐνέμαρτον τὴν ἀφηγήσειν ποιήσασθαι.

Euseb. Hist. Eccl. cap. 1.

Paul, founded a church at Rome. But we nowhere read in it, that Peter was bishop of that church. Whence I infer, either that this assertion of Jerome, “where he continues bishop of that city, preaching the gospel twenty-five years, made no part of that copy of the Canon Chronicus, to which Eusebius, when he composed his History, constantly resorted for materials, or that, if it was in that copy, Eusebius, on re-examining the subject, must have judged it erroneous. But, had such been his second thoughts, he would surely have acknowledged and proclaimed this error to the world. It is not credible, that he would knowingly publish a history so much at variance with his Canon without notifying the discrepance. That this chronological work therefore contained any record of Peter’s episcopate at Rome, is utterly incredible.

This story of Peter, prince of the apostles, having filled an episcopal chair one fourth part of a century at Rome, is related by no writer antecedent to Jerome. He consequently was the author of it. To give it some currency, he fathered it upon Eusebius. And to render it more current, he inserted it as an acknowledged fact in his Catalogue of Illustrious Authors; where it is thus written: “Simon Peter, in the second year of Claudius, went to Rome to encounter Simon Magus, and there occupied the episcopal chair twenty-five years.”*

* Simon Petrus, 2do Claudii anno ad expugnandum Simonem Magum Romam pergit; ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit.

. It has been mentioned above, that the earliest testimony produced by Dr. Troy to shew that Peter was bishop of Rome, is that of Pope Leo, who flourished in the fifth century. Yet these two evidences, which occur in Jerome's publications, are of an older date, are clear, express, and known to every tyro in polemical divinity. Why then were they not cited by our veteran polemick? Was he aware of the forgery? It should seem so. His not having referred to them cannot otherwise be accounted for.

This Jerome, who wrote in the fourth century*, was a man of most extensive learning, of great renown, a popular writer, and the oracle of his time. No wonder, therefore, that contemporary and subsequent writers in every corner of the Pope's dominions should give credit to and repeat this story. But then all those testimonies, whether contemporary or subsequent, respecting this controverted fact, are of no value whatever. They are the offspring of falsehood. For which reason Dr. Troy, who knows whence they sprang, ought not to have referred for evidence to any posterior writer. And the same reason would justify me in now terminating this inquiry, and closing my examination of those proofs and evidences which he has drawn from the fathers, with this assertion, that neither by any one, nor by any number of them, not even by them all, can

* His version of Eusebius was not published till after the year 380. His Catalogue of Illustrious Authors was written in 392.

Care's Hist. Liter. art. Hieronymus. Stridon.

it be clearly established, that St. Peter was bishop of Rome. Previous to Jerome's time, no proof whatever of this fact existed in the writings of any father. Jerome's testimony is a fiction. And all subsequent authorities are the spawn of this fiction. But I have engaged myself to furnish the reader with transcripts of all those dubious and subsequent testimonies, to which Dr. Troy has made references. I proceed to fulfil this engagement.

SECTION XVI.

POPE LEO.

The first two of those dubious and later evidences are Pope Leo's second and third orations, delivered by him on the anniversary day of his elevation to the papal throne. In the second oration, "The wished-for and honourable presence," says Leo, "of my venerable brethren and fellow-priests is also on this account the more sacred and devout; forasmuch as they ascribe the piety of this service, in which they have deigned to assist, chiefly to him, whom they know to be, not merely *president of this bishoprick*, but primate of all bishops.*" By "this bishoprick" we are to understand the see of Rome, and by "him" St. Peter. But as Leo speaks here in the present

* *Venerabilium quoque fratrum et consacerdotum meorum desiderata mihi et honoranda præsentia hinc sacratior est atque devotior, si pietatem hujus officii, in quo adesse dignati sunt, ei principaliter deferunt, quem non solum hujus sedis præsulem, sed et omnium episcoporum noverunt esse primate.*

tense, (know to be) these words of his holiness are no evidence, that Peter had formerly been bishop of Rome. They describe only what he then was.

The following extract from the third oration will elucidate those words: "To Peter is particularly entrusted the power of binding and loosing for this reason; because the ghost of Peter is set over all the rulers of the church.*" It appears to have been in Leo's days a prevailing notion among papists, that the ghost of Peter was bishop of all bishops (*episcopus episcoporum*), and that properly speaking the see of this ghost was not merely that of Rome, but a see over all sees (*sedes sedium*).† And this is Leo's meaning, where he says, that Peter was then not only president of the Roman see, but primate of all bishops.

Another passage in the second oration, apparently confirming the fundamental article of popery, is this: "If therefore any thing is rightly done and rightly discerned by us; if any thing is obtained from the mercy of God by daily supplications, all this is the effect of his deeds and merits, whose power lives, and

* *Petro enim ideo hoc (ligandi solvendique potestas) singulariter creditur, quia cunctis ecclesiæ rectoribus Petri forma præponitur.*

† The oath of a bishop in the church of Rome begins thus:—"I A. B. elected bishop of the church of C. from this hour will be faithful and obedient to the blessed Peter, the apostle." Whence it appears, that the papists of the present time believe in the episcopal sovereignty of Peter's ghost.

Orthod. Churches. Ap. 1805. p. 281.

whose authority excels in his own seat.*" The same apostle is still spoken of ; and Leo still speaks in the present tense. He could not therefore mean by *Peter's own seat* the episcopal chair at Rome: for that was then Leo's. The object immediately present to his holiness's mind, when he uttered this expression, was that most curious piece of workmanship of sylphs and gnomes, the empyreal chair, in which was conceived to preside the bishop of all bishops, St. Peter's ghost.

I come now to Leo's third oration. If there be any expression in this harangue, which in Dr. Troy's opinion clearly establishes this point, that St. Peter was bishop of Rome, it must be contained in the following passage :—"But if he (St. Peter) stretcheth the care of his piety over the whole people of God, how much more doth he vouchsafe to bestow his assistance upon us, his nurse-children, among whom he reposeth in the sacred bed of happy sleeping, that is, in the same carnal frame in which he presided? To him therefore be ascribed this birthday of our office, to him be ascribed this festival, by the constant aid of whose patronage we have merited a partnership in this see.†"

* Si quid itaque a nobis recte agitur recteque discernitur, si quid a misericordia Dei quotidianis supplicationibus obtinetur, illius est operum atque meritorum, cujus in sede sua vivit potestas, excellit auctoritas.

† Si autem hanc pietatis suæ curam omni populo Dei, sicut credendum est, ubique protendit, quanto magis nobis alumni suis opem suam dignatur impendere, apud quos in sacro beatæ dor—

As Peter was interred at Rome, these words of Leo, Pope of Rome, *in the same carnal frame, in which he presided*, appear at first sight to imply, that Peter had been bishop of Rome. And possibly Dr. Troy put this interpretation upon them. But the presidency here spoken of is far more extensive.

In this third oration Leo tells his audience, that “Peter had been alone chosen out of the whole world to be set over both the calling of all nations; and also over all apostles and all fathers of the church*,” that “he had been constituted by Christ Jesus prince of the whole church†,” and in this very passage, that “he stretcheth the care of his piety over the whole people of God.”

Nothing can be more certain therefore, than that the presidency or government, to which Pope Leo here alluded, was not an episcopal prelacy at Rome, but an universal sovereignty, which his holiness imagined Peter to have been invested with here upon earth, and at this apostle's decease to have been transferred to his ghost.

Leo concludes this part of his oration with saying

missionis toro, eadem, qua præsedit, carne, requiescit? Illi ergo hunc servitutis nostræ natalitium diem, illi ascribamus hoc festum, cujus patrocinio, sedis ipsius meruimus esse consortes, auxiliante nobis per omnia, &c.

* De toto mundo unus Petrus eligitur, qui et universarum gentium vocationi, et omnibus apostolis cunctisque ecclesiæ patribus præponatur.

† Quem Jesus Christus totius ecclesiæ principem fecit.

that *by the aid of Peter's patronage he had merited a partnership with Peter in his see*. Dr. Troy, it should seem, has interpreted the words, *his see* (*sedis ipsius*), to signify the see of Rome, but this could not be Leo's meaning. For he himself was then bishop of that see. And there cannot be legally at the same time, as Dr. Troy knows, two bishops of the same diocese. It may be urged indeed, and I confess with justice, that the law, which prohibits an episcopal duumvirate, does not bind ghosts. But, if by this expression, *his see*, we are to understand that bishoprick over which Peter's ghost presided, (and Peter being then dead, it must be so interpreted) the true signification of Leo's words is clear and indisputable. The diocese of Rome being one of those Christian bishoprics, over *all* which, as Leo believed, the ghost of St. Peter had been constituted governor, his holiness, the Pope of Rome, might style himself with great propriety a sharer and co-partner with Peter's ghost in the government of this universal see; with the same propriety of language, as the Duke of Cornwall or the lord lieutenant of a county might be called a sharer with the king of the united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in the government of this kingdom. His holiness boasts in this harangue, not of being partner with Peter in the bishoprick of Rome, but of participating with Peter's ghost in an universal bishoprick, and deems it a high honour to have been admitted to a share of this office.

SECTION XVII.

POPERY GROUNDLESS.

Dr. Troy's discernment of his discretion, when he appealed to Leo, seems to have forsaken him. The doctor has affirmed it to be "a fundamental article of the Catholic faith, that the Pope of Rome, as successor to St. Peter in that see, enjoys by divine right a primacy of real jurisdiction and authority in the Universal Church." Leo, who was himself a Pope, informed his hearers, that this universal primacy was vested in the ghost of Peter, and that to himself was delegated a portion of it. Whom are we to believe? Pope Leo. or Dr. Troy? Leo must have known better than Dr. Troy can know, what jurisdiction and authority he himself possessed. If he did enjoy universal sovereignty, he could not be ignorant of it. I therefore conclude, that in Leo's time the Pope of Rome had not a primacy of real jurisdiction and authority in the Universal Church, and that this fundamental article, on which popery is founded, is itself without foundation.

An Indian philosopher imagining, that the earth wanted something to bear it up, found an elephant to support it, and a tortoise to support his elephant. This tortoise he left *in vacuo*.*

* Locke on the Human Understanding, b. ii. ch. xiii. §. 19.

SECTION XVIII.

POPE GREGORY.

The next dubious authority, to which Dr. Troy has appealed, is a letter from Pope Gregory to Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria. In this epistle are two passages seemingly countenancing the fundamental article above-mentioned. One of them is this: "Wherefore, though there be many apostles, yet in respect of sovereignty the see of the Prince of the Apostles alone has increased in authority, which is the see of one in three places. For he erected a see, in which he deigned to take rest, and to finish this present life.*" By the Prince of the Apostles we are to understand in this passage the Apostle Peter. By the see, which he erected, is meant that of Rome. And as it is here affirmed, that in this see Peter deigned to take rest and to finish this present life, it is not to be wondered at, that a reader, searching for proofs of Peter's Roman episcopate, should have inferred from this extract, that this Prince of the Apostles died Bishop of Rome. But after a due attention to Pope Gregory's words, every reader must be satisfied, that in strictness of speech

* Itaque cum multi sint apostoli, pro ipso tamen principatu sola apostolorum principis sedes in auctoritate convaluit, quæ in tribus locis unius est. Ipse enim sublimavit sedem, in qua etiam quiescere et præsentem vitam finire dignatus est.

Greg. Epist. lib. vi. ep. 37.

they signify thus much only, that Peter, having erected a see at Rome, took up his abode and ended his days in that diocess; which he might do without being bishop of it. And this interpretation perfectly accords with the testimony of Irenæus. “The blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul,” saith this author, “having founded and erected a church at Rome, delivered the episcopal administration of it into the hands of Linus.*” Irenæus was born either at the close of the first, or soon after the commencement of the second century. But, if those two apostles put Linus in possession of this episcopal government, it is manifest, that neither of them, when he died, could himself be bishop of Rome.

SECTION XIX.

PETER’S CHAIR.

The other passage in Gregory’s letter is this: “Your holiness hath mentioned in your epistles many things most grateful to me concerning the chair of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, particularly, that in it he even now sitteth in his successors.†” If

* Θεμελιώσαντες ουν και οικοδομήσαντες οι μακαριοι αποστολοι την εκκλησιαν, Διω την της επισκοπης λειτουργιαν ενχειρισαν.

Iren. adv. Hær. l. iii. c. 3.

† Suavissima mihi sanctitas vestra multa in epistolis suis de sancti Petri, principis apostolorum, cathedra locuta est, dicens, quod ipse in ea nunc usque in successoribus suis sedeat.

Dr. Troy imagined (and he did, I believe, imagine) this passage to be evidence in his favour, he must have reasoned in this manner ; “ The chair in which the bishops of Rome sat, was called St. Peter’s chair. Therefore St. Peter had been bishop of Rome.” But the chair, in which the scribes and the Pharisees at Jerusalem sat, was called Moses’ chair.* Does it thence follow, that Moses had been either a scribe or a Pharisee ? Moreover, in this very epistle Gregory says expressly, that Eulogius, to whom it was addressed, and who was bishop of Alexandria, sat in Peter’s chair.† Are we thence to conclude that Peter was bishop of Alexandria ? of a city which he never visited ? This expression therefore, “ Peter’s chair,” (Petri cathedra) is no proof that Peter was bishop of Rome.

“ What else can this expression denote, but this apostle’s episcopal throne ?” I reply, His apostolical chair. This answer is founded upon the following particulars.

1. It is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles,‡ that Paul sat (ἐκαθίστοε) at Corinth a year and six months, teaching the word of God. But Paul was not bishop of that city. He sat and taught there as an apostle.

2. In an epistle of Theodorit to Pope Leo are these words : “ Peter and Paul have made your seat more illustrious...And now also their God, by placing you

* Matth. xxiii. 2.

† Sed cuncta quæ dicta sunt, in eo libenter accepi, quod ille mihi de Petri cathedra locutus est, qui Petri cathedram sedet.

‡ Acts, xviii. 11.

in *their seat*, hath rendered it famous and renowned.* The chair in which Leo, bishop of Rome, was then sitting, is here said to be the very chair in which Peter and Paul had sat. But Paul was never bishop of Rome. This therefore was the chair of the apostles, Peter and Paul.

3. In the epistle of Clement to James, bishop of Jerusalem, Peter is introduced informing the people of Rome, that he had ordained Clement to be their bishop, and had committed to him *the chair of his discourses*; that is, the chair from which his sermons had been delivered.† This epistle, it is true, is spurious. But it is, notwithstanding, sufficient evidence of what was understood by Peter's chair, when this letter was composed. And, that it was written at a very early period, almost all critics are agreed.

The origin of Peter's chair therefore was clearly this. As Paul sat (ἐκαθίσεν) eighteen months at Corinth, teaching the word of God, so did Peter, from the time of his last arrival at Rome till the appointment of Linus by Peter and Paul to the bishoprick of that city, sit at Rome, expounding the reve-

* Il (Petrus et Paulus) sedem vestram effecere magis illustrem — Illorum autem Deus nunc quoque illorum sedem claram insignemque reddidit, cum vestram sanctitatem in ea collocaverit.

† Κλημεντα τουτον επισκαπον ημιν χειροτονω, ω την ημεν των λογων τιμων καθεδραν.
Cottellerii Patr. Apust. p. 534.

In page 541 of this collection are these words, *Απὸς αὐτῆς καθέθη, την του διδασκοντος επιστευθη καθεδραν*, which will explain *την λογων καθεδραν*.

lations, which had been communicated to him by his Lord and Master.* But during all that interval he was exercising the office, not of bishop, but of apostle. Peter's chair at Rome therefore was apostolical.

4. It appears from the following quotation, that every apostolical church had its apostolical chair: "Take a survey of the apostolical churches," saith Tertullian, "in which the very chairs of the apostles still preside in their places;†" and from the following passage, that the chair at Rome was apostolical; "Knowing," saith Pope Innocent, "what respect is due to the *apostolical* chair."‡ Innocent is speaking, in this place, of the chair at Rome and of St. Peter. "The church of Rome," saith Augustine, "in which the pre-eminence of the *apostolical* chair hath always flourished;§" which words are a proof of the same thing.

I have no where met with this expression, "The episcopal chair of Peter," in the writings of the fathers, except in a work of Optatus Milevitanus. But, as the sentence, in which it there occurs, has been referred to by Dr. Troy, and not to evince this

* Christus discedens aperuit discipulis suis futura omnia, quæ Petrus et Paulus Romæ prædicaverunt.—*Lactant. Div. Inst. l. iv. c. 21.*

† Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsident.—*Tertull. De Præscrip. c. 36.*

‡ Scientes, quid apostolicæ sedi debeatur.—*August. Op. Epist. xci. Innoc. Aurelio.*

§ Romanæ ecclesiæ, in qua semper apostolicæ cathedræ viguit principatus.—*Ibid. Epist. clxii. Aug. Donato.*

point, that St. Peter was bishop of Rome, it may fairly be presumed, that this sentence was not considered by him as containing any proof whatever to substantiate this point ; and I need not therefore take any further notice of it.

5.. Lastly, *sella* means a seat only ; *sella curulis*, a seat of honour and authority. So is *cathedra episcopalis* (an episcopal chair), a throne of dignity and power. But *Petri cathedra* (Peter's chair) can signify the chair only of some private individual, whose name was Peter, or else κατ' ἐξοχην the chair of Peter, prince of the apostles. A third construction of these words there cannot be. And in this latter sense it manifestly is, that the expression *Petri cathedra* (Peter's chair) was used by Eulogius, and understood by Gregory. " Concerning the chair of Peter, PRINCE OF THE APOSTLES," saith Gregory to Eulogius, " your Holiness hath spoken many thing."* Concerning the chair of Peter, BISHOP of Rome, nothing is either mentioned, or even hinted at in this epistle.

SECTION XX.

PETER'S SUCCESSORS.

Is not, it may be asked, the chair of Peter, bishop of Rome, hinted at, where the bishops of Rome are

* Sanctitas vestra. . multa de sancti Petri, principis apostolorum cathedra locuta est.

In the same manner hath Galasius expressed himself—ad illam sedem, quam princeps apostolorum sederat Petrus.—*Gen. Tract. apud Labb. tom. ix. col. 1216.*

styled by Eulogius “successors of Peter?”* For of whom could the individuals in a series of bishops be properly called successors, but of some bishop? My answer is, Of some apostle or apostles, or of some associate of an apostle. And for the truth of this reply I appeal to the fathers of the 2d, 3d, and 4th centuries.

1. I begin with Irenæus, who wrote early in the second century. “We are able,” saith this author, “to enumerate those, who were constituted bishops by the apostles. To them the apostles would deliver the mysteries of the Gospel in an especial manner, they being desirous that those persons, whom they left their successors, should be perfect and unblameable in all things.”†

2. Tertullian, who lived in the same century, informs us, that Polycarp, the first bishop of Smyrna, was appointed to that bishoprick by John the apostle, and calls John on that account Polycarp’s antecessor.‡

* Dicens, quod ipse in ea nuncusque in *successoribus suis* sedeat.

† Habemus annumerare eos, qui ab apostolis instituti sunt episcopi. Etenim si recondita mysteria scissent apostoli. his vel maxime traderent ea, quibus etiam ipsas ecclesias committebant. Valde enim perfectos et irreprehensibiles in omnibus eos volebant esse, quos et *successores* relinquebant.—*Iren. adv. Hæc. l. iii. c. 3.*

‡ Cæterum si quæ hæreses audent interserere se ætati apostolicæ, ut ideo videantur ab apostolis traditæ, quia sub apostolis fuerant, possumus dicere, Edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum; evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per *successiones* ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit *auctorem et antecessorem*. Hoc enim modo co-

If this apostle was antecessor of Polycarp, Bishop Polycarp was successor of this apostle, antecessor and successor being correlative terms. But John had not himself been bishop of Smyrna. Polycarp therefore was successor in that see to an apostle.

In this manner originated the church of Smyrna. And such, Tertullian tells us, was the origin of every other apostolical church. Its first bishop had some apostle or some companion of an apostle for his antecessor. Consequently this first and every subsequent bishop of that church was the successor of some apostle, or of some one, whom an apostle had employed to labour with him in the Gospel. And from this term *antecessor* are we to derive this appellation “successor of the apostles.”*

clesiæ apostolicæ census suos deferunt: sicut Smyrnæorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Joanne conlocatum refert: sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum itidem: periade utique et cæteræ exhibent, quos ab apostolis in episcopatum constitutos apostolici seminis traduces habeant. Confinquant tale aliquid hæretici.—Tert. De Præscrip. Hæret. c. 32.

N.B. It is no objection to this account, that St. James, who was the first bishop of Jerusalem, was himself an apostle. For he did not assume this bishoprick of his own accord, but was appointed to it by the other apostles.—*Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. ii. c. 23. and l. vii. c. 19.*

* In the second book of Bernard De Consideratione St. Paul is styled antecessor to Eugenius, pope of Rome. And Bernard speaks also of (apostoli) apostles, that were Eugenius's antecessors. So that Eugenius was successor, not of St. Paul only, but also of some other apostle. And as Bernard has affirmed, that Peter's prerogative had descended to this Pope, it is just to suppose, that this other antecessor of Eugenius was the apostle Peter.

3. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, who flourished about the middle of the third century, hath repeatedly styled bishops successors of the apostles.*

4. Jerome, who was an author of the fourth century, in an epistle to Euagrius tells this patriarch, that bishops, whether rich or poor, are all successors of apostles.†

I venture to conclude therefore that these expressions, *Peter's chair*, *Peter's successors*, afford no proof whatever, that Peter was bishop of Rome, and that the authority exercised by Peter in that city was not episcopal, but apostolical. As both these expressions frequently occur in the writings of the fathers, and the advocates of popery having always considered them as irresistible evidence in their favour, the protestant reader will pardon me, I trust, for having so long detained him in tracing their origin, and enabling him to ascertain, what is their real import.

SECTION XXI.

GENERAL COUNCILS.

Lastly, Roman catholicks, we are informed by Dr. Troy, conceive this point, that St. Peter was

* Unitatem a Domino et per apostolos nobis successoribus traditam.—*Cyp. Op. Epist. xlv.*

† Potentia divitiarum, et paupertatis humilitas vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem episcopum non facit. Cæterum omnes apostolorum successores sunt.—*Hieron. Epist. ad Euag.*

bishop of Rome, to be clearly established by the express decisions of their general councils. The nine general councils, to which the Doctor has appealed, have been specified above.* Two of those councils have indeed styled the bishops of Rome successors of St. Peter. But not one of them in its decisions hath styled St. Peter bishop of Rome. Such is my report of the express decisions of those general councils.

SECTION XXII.

IRENÆUS.

Having given faithful transcripts of those passages in the fathers, which to some persons may at first sight appear to favour this position, that St. Peter was bishop of Rome, I proceed to give other extracts, the contents of which seem to be adverse to it. For in no controversy can the truth be otherwise ascertained, than by weighing with impartial judgment the contradictory evidences, and duly examining, on which side the preponderancy sways.

The first opposing evidence, which I shall produce, is that of Irenæus, a disciple of Polycarp. His testimony in this. “The blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, having founded and built a church at Rome, they delivered the episcopal office into the hands of Linus. To him succeeds Anencletus: after whom, in the third place from the apostles,

* See page 260.

Clemens obtains the episcopate. The successor of this Clemens is Euarestus, and of Euarestus Alexander. Then Xystus is appointed, the sixth from the apostles. After him is Telesphorus. And then Hyginus. Next Pius; after whom is Anicetus. Soter having succeeded Anicetus, Eleutherus, now, in the twelfth place from the apostles, holds the episcopal office*."

In the year 54 of the Christian æra St. Paul addressed an epistle to the Christians at Rome. Three years afterwards he was brought a prisoner to that city. During his continuance in it he daily preached the Gospel, and converted vast numbers to the Christian religion. Two years being expired, he was released from his imprisonment, and carried the glad tidings of salvation into distant regions. In the year 63, or very early in the year ensuing he returned to Rome†. And nearly at the same time St. Peter made his first visit to the same city. By their combined assiduity these two great luminaries so rapidly

* Θεμελιώσαντες οὖν καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακαριοὶ ἀποστόλοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Δίνω τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχειρίσαν. Διαδέχεται δὲ αὐτὸν Ἀνεγκλήτος. Μετὰ τοῦτον δὲ τρίτῳ τοπῷ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν κληροῦται Κλημης. Τὸν δὲ Κλημεντα τοῦτον διαδέχεται Εὐαρεστος. Καὶ τὸν Εὐαρεστον Ἀλεξάνδρος. Εἰθ' οὕτως ἕκτος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καθίσταται Ξύστος. Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Τελεσφῶρος. Ἐπειτα Τύγης. Εἰτα Πίος. Μεθ' οὖν Ἀνίκητος. Διαδέξαμενου τοῦ Ἀνικητοῦ Σωτήρης, νυν δωδεκάτῳ τοπῷ τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κατέχει κληρὸν Ἐλευθερος.

Iren. adver. Hæres. l. iii. c. 3.

† Cave's Hist. Lit. t. i. p. 6.

augmented the number of Christian proselytes,* as to be able very soon to form in different parts of the city distinct congregations. And to each of these assemblies they appointed a pastor. This formation of parishes (if I may so express myself) and appointment of ministers is what Irenæus calls “founding and building a church.” The structure being completed, neither of those fellow-labourers did himself assume the superintendence of it; but they jointly committed this charge to another person.† To him succeeded others in that episcopal office, who are enumerated by Irenæus. But in this enumeration Peter is not mentioned. He is repeatedly styled an apostle by this venerable author; but is nowhere classed by him among the bishops of Rome.

When can he indeed have entered upon this office? Before the church of Rome was founded, there could be no bishop of Rome. The foundation of it was laid, and the structure erected, by the united workmanship of Peter and Paul.‡ Neither of them was sole director. And this spiritual edifice being

* Τουτοις τοις ανδρασιν οσιως πολιτευσαμενοις συνηβοισθη πολυ πληθος εκλεκτων.—*Clement. Rom. Epist. i. ad Corinth. c. vi.*

† Some writers have made Clemens, not Linus, first bishop of Rome. On which account I have purposely in this place used an indefinite expression. Whoever was appointed overseer by Peter and Paul, the train of reasoning will be the same.

‡ That this was their united workmanship, we have the testimony, not of Irenæus only, but also of Caius, a presbyter of Rome, who was, if not altogether, almost his contemporary.

Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. ii. c. 25.

finished, Peter concurred with Paul in immediately appointing another person to the government of it.

Attend moreover to Irenæus's manner of enumerating. He has not contented himself with barely recording names; but in some instances has specified, at what numeral distance a particular bishop was from the founders of the church at Rome; which renders this extract from his writings, unquestionable evidence. I pass over the first three bishops, the order of their succession being matter of dispute. But what says our author concerning Xystus? That he was the sixth. From whom? - From Peter BISHOP of Rome? No. From the apostles Peter and Paul. The point, from which he reckons, is this apostolical duumvirate. And reckoning from it, how many bishops preceded Xystus? Exclusive of either Peter or Paul, he had five predecessors; Linus, Anencletus, Clements, Euarestus, Alexander. Had Peter also been one, Xystus would have been the seventh bishop from that duumvirate. He is styled by Irenæus the sixth. This shows incontrovertibly, that the name of Peter has not been lost out of Irenæus's catalogue of Roman pontiffs through the negligence of copiers. Consequently this name had not originally a place in his catalogue. But, had Peter been one of Xystus's predecessors, Irenæus being a catholic bishop, and living not far from Rome almost in what is called the apostolical age, he could not be ignorant of this fact, nor would he have failed to record it. The conclusion from these premises

* He was bishop of Lyons.

that this apostle was not a predecessor of Xystus in the episcopal see of Rome ; in other words, that he never was bishop of that see.

Irenæus has made Linus successor of these two apostles, Peter and Paul. Augustine and some other ecclesiastical writers have said, that Linus succeeded Peter. But this discrepance is not a contradiction. If one historian has mentioned, that there were two eye-witnesses to a fact, and another has named one only, this other hath not denied, that more witnesses were present. According to St. Matthew,* when Jesus was near Jericho, two blind men sat by the way-side begging. St. Mark's account† is this : as Jesus was going from Jericho, blind Bartimæus sat by the highway-side begging. But this latter evangelist doth not say, that Bartimæus, and no other blind man, accosted our Saviour near Jericho. Neither hath Augustine or any other writer affirmed, that Linus was the successor of Peter alone. Differences of this nature are frequent, as well in profane, as in sacred writings.

SECTION XXIII.

EUSEBIUS.

My next adverse witness is Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea. It has already been mentioned, that this prelate composed a history of the church of Christ.‡

* Matt. xx. 30. † Mark x. 46.

‡ See page 271.

Near the beginning of the third book of this history we are told, that the first bishop of Rome after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul was Linus.* And from subsequent places in this work we learn, that the next eleven in the series of Roman bishops were these, Anencletus, Clemens, Euarestus, Alexander, Xystus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, Soter, Eleutherus. Nowhere in it is Peter denominated bishop of Rome. On the contrary, in three passages he is excluded by this author from the list of Roman pontiffs.

1. The first of these excluding passages is this : “ Euarestus having completed his eighth year in the see of Rome, Alexander enters upon the episcopal office there, being the fifth from Peter and Paul in the series of bishops:†” According to Eusebius’s narrative there intervened between Peter and Paul, who planted the church at Rome, and Alexander, a bishop of that church, these four bishops, Linus, Anencletus, Clemens, Euarestus. Had Peter been the first bishop of Rome, five bishops must have preceded Alexander ; and consequently Alexander must have been the sixth. Eusebius styles him the fifth. Peter therefore was no

* Της δε Ρωμαιων εκκλησιας μετα την Παυλου και Πετρου μαρτυριαν πρωτος κληρουται την επισκοπην Λινος.

Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. iii. c. 2.

† Αλεξανδρος, επι Ρωμης ογδοον ετος αποπληρωσαντος Ευαρεστο πεμπτην απο Πετρου και Παυλου καταγων διαδοχην, την επισκοπην απολαμβάνει.

Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. c. 1.

numbered by this historian with the bishops of the Roman see.

2. The next is this passage: "Xystus having held the episcopate at Rome ten years, Telesphorus succeeds to it, being the seventh from the apostles."* As Alexander was succeeded by Xystus, and Xystus by Telesphorus, and it having been shewed above, that supposing the apostle Peter to have been a predecessor of Alexander in the see of Rome, Alexander must have been the sixth bishop there, it follows, that Telesphorus, on the same supposition, must have been the eighth. But Eusebius calls him in this place the seventh from the apostles. From whence it clearly follows, that this historian's catalogue of Roman pontiffs did not comprehend Peter.

3. The following is the third passage: "Soter, after having filled the episcopal chair at Rome eight years, departs this life. Him succeeds Eleutherus, the twelfth from the apostles.†" The seventh from the apostles was Telesphorus; between whom and Eleutherus intervened these four, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, Soter. Consequently, reckoning from the apostles Peter and Paul exclusively, Eleutherus

* Ήντοι δεκάετη χρόνον αποπλησάντα ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐπισκοπῆς, ἑβδόμος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων διαδέχεται Τηλεσφορος.

Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. iv. c. 5.

† Ο μὲν οὖν τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκοπος Σωτὴρ ἐπὶ ογδοῶν ἔτος ἡγησάμενος, τελευτᾷ τοῦ βίου τοῦτον δωδεκάτος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων Ἐλεutheros διαδέχεται.

Id. l. v. proem.

was the twelfth. And he is styled here by Eusebius the twelfth from the apostles. It is manifest therefore, that in this author's list of Roman pontiffs neither Peter nor Paul was included. Each of them was an apostle; neither of them bishop in the ordinary acceptation of this word.

As Eusebius's history abounds in quotations from the following writers of the first century, Clemens Romanus, Ignatius the martyr, and Polycarp, also from Papias, Quadratus, Justin the martyr, Irenæus, Melito, Apollinaris, Dionysius of Corinth, Hegesippus, Tatian, Rhodon, Serapion, Apollonius, Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Polycrates, who wrote in the second century; and from Caius, Alexander bishop of Cappadocia, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Anatolius, writers of the third, it must be acknowledged, that he had examined, if not the whole, at least all those parts, of their writings, which related to the first planting and first governors of the Christian church. And if Peter had indeed been the first bishop of Rome, a fact of this magnitude must have been recorded by some of those early authors, and could not escape the eye of this industrious compiler in his search after materials for an ecclesiastical history. So that his not mentioning this fact cannot justly be attributed to ignorance or inadvertency. Indeed, the only assignable cause of this omission, which carries with it the least semblance of probability, is, that Peter was not the first bishop of Rome.

SECTION XXIV.

POPERY GROUNDLESS.

That Peter was the first bishop of Rome, is that fact, on which popery is founded. Had Eusebius then, contrary to the evidence of preceding writers, omitted in his enumeration of Roman bishops the name of Peter, would anyone subsequent author, professing popery, have spoken of his history in terms of commendation? Certainly not. Yet have two early and learned Popes of Rome, Gelasius*, and Pelagius II.† testified in its favour. This is an argument against the reality of the fact in question, which no papist can refute.

SECTION XXV.

EPIPHANIUS.

The last adverse testimony, which I shall produce, is a passage in Epiphanius's works, the substance of which is this: "Anicetus bishop of Rome succeeded Pius and the bishops preceding Pius. For there were at Rome, first Peter and Paul; these were apostles and bishops; next Linus; then Cletus*; then Clemens. This Clemens was contemporary with Peter and Paul. But let no one wonder on that

* Gel. Pap. in Decreto de Libris Apoc.

† Pel. II. Pap. in Epist. 3. ad Eliam, &c.

* This person is by Irenæus and Eusebius called Anencletus.

account, that others were appointed by these two apostles to the bishoprick of Rome before him. Possibly this happened in the following manner. Clemens may have been consecrated bishop when Peter and Paul were living, may have requested permission of them not to undertake the government of the see, and may have been permitted to live in retirement. But as Peter and Paul frequently made excursions into other countries, and as the city of Rome ought not to have been left without a bishop, these two apostles, supposing Clemens to have declined the office, would doubtless appoint other persons in succession to it. When Peter, Paul, Linus, and Cletus were dead, Clemens may then have judged it necessary to quit his retirement, and take upon himself the episcopal government at Rome.†”

† Ανικητου επισκοπου Ρωμη, του κατα την διαδοχην Πιου και των ανωτερων. Εν Ρωμη γαρ γεγονασι πρωτοι Πετρος και Παυλος, οι αποστολοι αυτοι και επισκοποι· ειτα Λινος, ειτα Κλητος, ειτα Κλημης, συγχρονος ων Πετρου και Παυλου, ου επιμνημονευει Παυλος εν τη προς Ρωμαιους επισολη. Και μηδεις θαυμαζετω, οτι προ αυτου αλλοι την επισκοπην διεδεξαντο απο των αποστολων, οντος τουτου συγχρονου Πετρου και Παυλου, και ουτος γαρ συγχρονος γινεται των αποστολων. Ειτ’ ον ετι περιοντων αυτων υπο Πετρου λαμβανει την χειροθεσιαν της επισκοπης, και παραιτησαμενος ηργει ητσι μετα την των αποστολων διαδοχην υπο Κλητου του επισκοπου ουτος καθισαται, ου πανυ σαφως ισμεν. Πλην αλλα και ουτως ηδυνατο, ετι περιοντων των αποστολων, (φημι δε των περι Πετρον και Παυλον) επισκοπους αλλους καθισασθαι, δια το τους αποστολους πολλακις επι τας αλλας πατριδας την πορειαν τελλεσθαι, δια το κηρυγμα του Χριστου, μη δυνασθαι δε την των Ρωμαιων πολιν ανευ επισκοπου ειναι. Ο μεν γαρ Παυλος και επι την Ισπα-

This passage consists partly of facts and partly of conjectures. The principal facts related in it are, that the first governors of the church at Rome were Peter and Paul; that these two personages jointly ruled it in their apostolico-episcopal capacity; that after them Linus was bishop of Rome; that the next bishop was Cletus; and that Cletus was succeeded by Clemens. Epiphanius has not asserted in this quotation, that the bishops of Rome were, first Peter and Paul, secondly Peter, thirdly Linus, and so forth. Peter is not otherwise mentioned in it, than as Paul is spoken of. And it has never been contended, that Paul was such a bishop of Rome, as Linus and Cletus and Clemens were. It therefore follows from the historical part of this quotation, that, in the ordinary acceptation of the word *bishop*, Peter was not bishop of Rome. He was a bishop, being an apostle*; but not the bishop of a limited diocess. His superintendency was coextensive with the Christian church.

One of Epiphanius's conjectures ratifies this inference. "Peter and Paul," says he, "frequently

νιαν αφικνειται, Πετρος δε πολλakis Ποντον τε και Βιθυνιαν επεσκεψατο. Ενεχωρει δε μετα το κατασταθηναι Κλημεντα και παραιτησασθαι, (ειγη ουτως επραχθη, διανοουμαι γαρ, ουκ οριζομαι) υτερον μετα το τετελευτηκεναι Λινου και Κλητον, επισκοπευσαντας προς δεκαδυο ετη εκαστον, μετα την του αγιου Πετρου και Παυλου τελευτην, την επι τω δωδεκατω ετει Νερωνος γενομενην, τουτον αυθις αναγκασθηναι την επισκοπην κατασχειν.

Επιρη κατα Καρποκ. *Ησπ.* vii. σive πcxi.

* Compare Acts, c. i v. 20. with v. 25.

left Rome to carry the tidings of salvation into distant regions. But it could not be that Rome should be without a bishop. Wherefore these apostles, if Clemens did decline the office, probably ordained others to it. The predecessors of Clemens were Linus and Cletus." This, it is true, is conjectural reasoning only. But is it credible, that any man in his senses would reason in this manner, unless he verily believed, that neither Peter nor Paul had been singly bishop of Rome, and such a bishop also, as Linus or as Cletus had been? These two latter persons are not here spoken of as temporary substitutes; but are numbered with Clemens in the series of real bishops. And the conjecture, that Peter and Paul, after Clemens had been allowed to withdraw from public life, constituted Linus, and afterwards Cletus, permanent bishops of Rome with plenary jurisdiction, is utterly incompatible with a belief, that either of these apostles was himself bishop of that capital. Thus much for the facts and conjectures of which this passage consists.

Let us next attend to the manner in which Epiphanius here speaks of Peter. It clearly, I think, indicates, that this author had never heard or dreamed of this prince of the apostles having been solely, and, in the ordinary way, bishop of any diocese. "Both Peter and Paul," saith he, "made frequent excursions into other countries to preach Christ crucified. Paul went into Spain. Peter oftentimes visited Pontus and Bithynia." And, that such distant and numerous peregrinations were not consistent

with the duties of a bishop, as contradistinguished to an apostle, Epiphanius was evidently well aware; for he has added, “ But it was not possible, that Rome should be without a bishop.” Peter, therefore, is described by this author, not as a bishop constantly resident in, and superintending the spiritual affairs of some particular district, but as an apostle of Christ without any settled abode, and faithfully executing this commission of his Master, “ Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature*.”

SECTION XXVI.

PETER WAS NOT THE FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

Such are the consentient testimonies of three bishops, Irenæus, Eusebius, and Epiphanius†; all of them men of extensive erudition, and in ecclesiastical records eminently versed. It is a fundamental article in the papal creed, that the present bishop of Rome hath, and that every former bishop of that see had, as successor of Peter in it, a divine right to universal sovereignty in the church of Christ. It is assumed in this article, that the first bishop of Rome was Peter, prince of the apostles; and on the justness of this assumption entirely depends the justness of this papal claim to uni-

* Mark, xvi. 15.

† Epiphanius was made bishop of Salamis in the island of Cyprus, A.D. 308.

versal dominion. Now, had Peter preceded Linus in the bishoprick of Rome, none of those three learned prelates could be ignorant of this fact, the history of the Christian church being their favourite and particular study, and it not being at all probable, that any of them in his researches would stop short at the second bishop of a church, so pre-eminent as that of Rome. What author of a complete history of the Roman empire hath not mentioned Romulus? And, as none of them could be ignorant of this fact, so neither can any of them have omitted to mention it through heedlessness and inadvertency. It is possible, indeed, that a transcriber, in copying a long series of names, may leave out one through oscitancy about the middle or near the end of the series. But that any scribe, however negligent, should overlook the first name, is utterly inconceivable. What compositor in a printing office, employed on a new edition of Luke's gospel, in the third chapter of which is given a genealogy of our Saviour, ever left out *Joseph*? Every one of those three prelates then, had Peter really been the first bishop of Rome, must have recorded this fact. But in their enumerations of those bishops of the Roman church, who succeeded the apostles, Peter and Paul, joint founders of that church, they have all placed Linus first.

And let it not be forgotten, that, not only in the writings of those three prelates, all of whom preceded Jerome, but in no publication of any other author anterior to him, is this fact upon record.

When that chronological work; in which it is related by Jerome, made its publick appearance, St. Peter had been interred more than three hundred years. But of Jerome's forgery enough has been said above*.

What now has Dr. Troy opposed to this clear and accumulated evidence of Linus being the first bishop of the Roman church, and to this total silence for three centuries respecting Peter's episcopate? No witness whatever prior to Jerome, nor Jerome himself, but two later authors, Leo the great, and Gregory the great. But neither of these Popes has expressly said in any part of his writings, to which Dr. Troy has referred us, nor, to my knowledge, in any other part, that the first bishop of Rome was Peter. And it has been showed above†, that those expressions in their writings, which carry with them an appearance of being proofs and evidences, that Peter had exercised episcopal authority at Rome, distinct from his apostolical powers, are in reality allusions to very different things; one to an universal sovereignty, with which Leo imagined the apostle Peter to have been invested in his lifetime; others to the same imaginary dominion transferred to Peter's ghost; and the rest to the acts of Peter's apostleship. It cannot be doubted therefore, on which side the preponderancy of evidence is, the result of this investigation manifestly being, that Linus, not Peter, was the first bishop of Rome.

* Section XV.

† Sections XVI, XVIII, XIX, XX.

SECTION XXVII.

NO DIVINE RIGHT.

It has been demonstrated, that Linus was the first bishop of Rome. Therefore every other bishop was successor in that see, not of Peter, but of Linus.

The divine right of every bishop of Rome to universal sovereignty has been placed by Dr. Troy, and by all other advocates for popery, upon this foundation, that every bishop of Rome was successor to St. Peter in that see. It has been proved, that every bishop of Rome, except the first, was successor to Linus, not to Peter. Consequently there is no foundation for this divine right.

SECTION XXVIII.

RECAPITULATION AND INFERENCE.

Having established this point, that the divine right, on which the Pope's claim to universal sovereignty rests, is without foundation, I shall now return to that argument, which the host of subscribers to Ward's Errata have brought forward to demonstrate, that bishops, priests, and deacons, being protestants, are without consecration, ordination, mission, succession, and pastoral jurisdiction. This argument has already been exhibited in page 257. But as the train of my reasoning will be rendered more perspicuous by bringing this *sortes*

nearer the conclusion of the last section, I shall here repeat it.

“ The bishop of Rome was chief patriarch of the western church, and consequently of this nation, when Dr. Parker was appointed archbishop of Canterbury.

“ The chief patriarch of the western church, or some one authorized by him, can alone give pastoral jurisdiction to the primate of England, or to the primate of Ireland.

“ The primate of a nation, or some one authorized by him, or his superior, can alone give pastoral jurisdiction to the metropolitan of a province.

“ The metropolitan of a province, or some one authorized by him, or his superior, can alone give pastoral jurisdiction to the bishop of a diocese within that province.

“ The bishop of a diocese, or some bishop commissioned from him, or his superior, can alone institute a pastor to a parish church within that diocese.

“ Dr. Parker, the first protestant primate in England, did not receive pastoral jurisdiction from the bishop of Rome.

“ Consequently, neither this primate, nor any metropolitan consecrated by him, nor any bishop consecrated by such metropolitan, nor any pastor of a parish church instituted by such bishop, nor any succeeding primate, metropolitan, bishop, or parish priest, of the church established in England, from the time of archbishop Parker's consecration to the

present moment, ever had, or now hath, pastoral jurisdiction."

It is a principle in logick universally acknowledged, that, if of this species of argument any one of the premises is refuted, the conclusion is thereby disproved. Such being the nature of Ward's argument, I undertook to examine the first proposition in it, namely, whether it be true or not, that, when Dr. Parker was constituted archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Rome was patriarch of England. And to shew, that this is not true, I quoted from an act of the English parliament these words: "The king, our sovereign lord, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the church of England." This law was enacted in the reign of Henry VIII. Dr. Parker was promoted to the see of Canterbury by Queen Elizabeth. So that the bishop of Rome by an act of the English legislature had been deprived of his English patriarchy long before this promotion.

The papists maintain, that this deprivation was unjust and impious. The bishop of Rome, say they, from the very origin of the Roman church always had by *divine right* an ecclesiastical sovereignty everywhere in Christendom; and no act of man can annul a divine right. But it has been demonstrated, that, as what is termed by them a *divine right* on this occasion, solely rests upon this ground, that Peter, prince of the apostles, was the first bishop of Rome, this *divine right* is a baseless fiction. Whence it follows, that, when Dr. Parker was made archbishop

of Canterbury, the bishop of Rome was not patriarch of this nation. And the first link in Ward's chain of premises being thus broken in pieces, the conclusion appendant to it falls of course to the ground.

The conclusion appendant to this chain is the second of those three charges, which the subscribers to Ward's Errata have brought against us protestants. This second accusation therefore is now refuted.

SECTION XXIX.

THE THIRD ACCUSATION.

The third accusation preferred by those subscribers is, that bishops, priests, and deacons, being protestants, and all their flocks, are guilty of sacrilege. This charge is the substance of the two following corollaries to the conclusion of Ward's *sorites*.

“ Do they not commit a most heinous sacrilege, who having neither valid ordination, nor pastoral jurisdiction, do notwithstanding take upon them to administer sacraments, and exercise all other acts of episcopal and priestly functions ?

“ Are not the people also involved with them in the same sin, so often as they communicate with them in, or co-operate to, those sacrilegious presumptions ?”

There are two species of sacrilege ; one of which is a forcible and unjust appropriation of the church's revenues ; the other a profanation of sacred things.

Now, if it were true, that bishops, priests, and deacons, being protestants, are without consecration, ordination, and pastoral jurisdiction, it would also be true, that all of them, who claim and receive tythes, or any other ecclesiastical property, do rob the church, and moreover that all of them, who administer the sacraments, seeing that they administer them with unhallowed hands, do profane things sacred. But the conclusion of Ward's *sorites*, that bishops, priests, and deacons, being protestants, are without consecration, ordination, and pastoral jurisdiction, has been disproved. Consequently this last charge, which is wholly founded upon that conclusion, is a gross calumny.

**CHRIST, AND NOT SAINT PETER, THE
ROCK OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH;
AND SAINT PAUL, THE FOUNDER OF
THE CHURCH IN BRITAIN:**

**A LETTER TO THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESS
OF ST. DAVID'S.**

**BY THOMAS BURGESS, D.D. F.R.S. & F.A.S.
BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.**

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE *first* object of the following pages, is to shew that the Christian church was not founded on St. Peter, but on "the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone," that is, on the predictions of the prophets, the testimony of the apostles, and the promises of Jesus Christ; that the first Christian church was the church of Jerusalem; and St. James, the first Christian bishop; that St. James, and not St. Peter, presided at the first Christian council; that St. Paul was the first founder of the church of Rome; that the church of Rome was established, as a Christian society during St. Paul's first residence at Rome; and that the first Bishop of Rome was appointed by the joint authority of St. Peter and St. Paul, after St. Paul's return to Rome.

The *next* object is to shew, that St. Paul preached the Gospel in Britain, and to ascertain, as nearly as possible, the time of the apostle's journey to

Britain, on the authority of Clemens Romanus, Eusebius, Jerome, Theodoret, and two British records.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans was written before the apostle's first journey to Rome, as is evident from the Epistle itself.* The dates of the journey and of the epistle will of course influence each other. If St. Paul was sent prisoner to Rome A.D. 56, the epistle could not have been written in the year 57, or any later year. And if the epistle was written A.D. 57, St. Paul could not have been sent prisoner to Rome in 56. But the choice of a date for the epistle must be governed by the journey, and not the time of the journey by the dates assigned to the epistle. To the latter, various dates are assigned.

Historia Eccles. Magdeb.	A.D. { 53. — 54.
Simson	A.D. 55.
Pearson	A.D. 57.
Lardner	A.D. 58.
Usher	A.D. 60.

I have exhibited this variety of dates, that the reader may not at once conclude, that St. Paul's first *journey* to Rome was not A. D. 56, because he finds the date of 57, or 58, or 60, assigned to the *Epistle* by different writers. These several dates appear to arise from the omission of St. Paul's journey to the West in arranging the chronology of the

* Ch. i. ver. 10: 13.

Apostle's ministry. If St. Paul preached the Gospel in Britain after his release from his first imprisonment at Rome, and if that imprisonment commenced in the 2d or 3d of Nero, as I hope, in both cases, to prove in the following pages, the Epistle must be dated A. D. 53 or 54,—*circiter ultimum Claudii*,—as in the *Historia Ecclesiastica Magdeburgica*, or A. D. 55, as in *Simson's Chronicon*.

It may be interesting and useful, in the consideration of St. Paul's relation to the Church of Rome, to keep in view the state of that Church *before the Apostle's first journey*, as far as can be collected from the Epistle to the Romans.

The Epistle is addressed to “all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be Saints.”

Names of Christian converts at Rome, to whom St. Paul sends his salutations.

Romans, Ch. XVI.

Ver. 1. Phebe, our Sister.

3. Priscilla }
Aquila } my helpers in Christ.

5. The Church that is in their house.

Epenetus, my well beloved.

6. Mary, who bestowed much labour on us.

7. Andronicus }
Junia } my kinsmen.

8. Amplias, my beloved.

9. Urbane, our helper.

Stachys, my beloved.

10. Apelles, approved in Christ.
Aristobulus's household.
11. Herodion, my kinsman.
Narcissus's household.
12. Tryphena } who labour in the Lord.
Tryphosa }
- Persis, the beloved.
13. Rufus, chosen in the Lord.
Rufus's mother.
14. Asyncritus.
Phlegon.
Hermas,
Patrobas.
Hermes, and the brethren, which are with
15. Philologus. [them.
Julia.
Nereus.
Nereus's Sister.
Olympas.
All the Saints, that are with them.

Testimonia de prima Ecclesiæ Romanæ fundatione.

1. Constabit inde manifesto non magno ante obitum Apostolorum intervallo et fundatam ab Apostolis Ecclesiam Romanam, & præfectum adeo ab eisdem fuisse Linum. DODWELL de Pontificum Romanorum Successione.

2. Nos contra probavimus eodem anno quo decesserunt Apostoli, & formatam esse Ecclesiam, Romanam & præfectum adeo illi, primum Episcopum fuisse Linum. IDEM ibidem.

3. Cum Petrus & Paulus fundarent Ecclesiam, hoc est, Apostolis illis adhuc superstitibus, Linus Romæ Episcopus constitutus est, ut docet Irenæus. PEARSON. *De annis priorum Romæ Episcoporum*, p. 168.

**AN INQUIRY INTO THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN
CHURCH, AND PARTICULARLY OF THE CHURCH
IN BRITAIN.**

Reverend Brethren,

THE origin of the Christian Church, and particularly of the Church in Britain, are questions which deeply concern us as Christians and Protestants. The proof of either establishes our belief in Christianity; and annuls the supremacy of the Church of Rome.

If the Pope has no pretension to that supremacy which the Papists ascribe to him, and which detaches the Papists of this Empire from the allegiance in ecclesiastical matters, which is due to their Sovereign, and to the laws, it is greatly to be lamented, that so false a principle should be a cause of separation between two great portions of the Christian Church, and should alienate one part of our fellow-subjects from the duty, which the rest pay to their King, and to the laws, of which he is the sworn guardian; and that on this false principle should be built the inflammatory complaints of their advocates in Parliament, and out of it, as if the Papists were suffering in this country for conscience' sake, by being deprived of civil rights for want of that conformity, which their consciences condemn. Five sixths of the subjects of these Kingdoms have

some centuries renounced all *foreign jurisdiction*. One fifth still adheres to it in opposition to those constitutional principles, on which our Protestant government is founded, and which, for the security of the Protestant succession, placed the present Royal family on the throne. Yet for the sake of this one-fifth part of our fellow-subjects, it is contended, that those principles ought to be abandoned, to make way for an unconstitutional exemption founded on imaginary pretensions.

The *supremacy of the Pope* rests on a misinterpretation of Scripture. When our Saviour said to Simon, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church," he did not mean to give to any particular Church, or to the bishop of such Church, the right of supremacy over all other Churches. The words have no relation to such power or authority. In the passage which precedes these words, our Saviour says, "Whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood have not revealed *it* unto thee; but my Father, which is in heaven:" to which he adds, "and I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon *this* rock I will build my Church."* *This* rock refers to *it*, the confession, which St. Peter had just made, that Jesus was the Messiah. This confession is the foundation of the Christian church.

* Matth. xvi. 18.

It was on this confession that the first converts were admitted into the church of Christ. St. Paul says to the church of Ephesus, "Ye are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone." Their faith was built on the predictions of the Prophets, and testimony of the Apostles, the testimony and predictions of both uniting in Jesus Christ. The church was founded on the Prophets and Apostles, not on St. Peter or St. Paul in particular. St. Peter was a part of this foundation, but not a part on which the Church was solely or chiefly to depend. He was one of the stones of that edifice, of which Christ was the chief corner-stone. If the Church could be said to be founded on any individual Apostle, it was founded on St. James, who was the first Bishop of the first Christian Church. The Church of Christ was not founded on St. Peter individually, but on him, and the other Apostles; and not on them, properly speaking, but on their doctrine, the *Messiaship of Jesus*.

Christ addressed his question to *all* the apostles: whom say ye that I am? St. Peter's answer was in the name of all. The commission of the Keys was addressed to St. Peter, not exclusively, but in common with the rest. "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Christ here only announces his intention of what he should do; and we may judge of what was intended by what was afterwards done. Christ says not I *now* give, but I *will* give. And that future commission was the final com-

mission in his last conversation with them on earth. And what was that commission? To preach the Gospel, and to baptize all nations: To preach the *doctrine* of Christ, and to admit into the *Church* of Christ. By the *kingdom of heaven*, the keys of which were to be given to St. Peter, was meant *the Gospel* and *the Church of Christ*.* In his final commission to the Apostles, Christ did not commit the charge of *preaching* and *baptizing* to any one Apostle above the rest, but to all. St. Peter had in this charge no pre-eminence or superior authority. He was not the foundation, on which the Church was to be built, but a part of it. He was not *petra*, but *Petrus*.

That St. Peter was not the rock, on which Christ said he would build his Church, is, I think, evident from the change of terms in the words of our Saviour. "Thou art *Petrus* (Peter) and on this *petra* (rock) I will build my Church." If our Saviour had meant that St. Peter should be the rock, on which he would build his Church, the same term might have been repeated: "Thou art *Petrus*, and on this *petrus* I will build my Church." For *petrus*, like its corres-

* The different meanings of βασιλεια των ουρανων are thus enumerated by Schleusner, Lex. Nov. Test. α. tempus adventus Christi in his terris; β. omnis salus et felicitas per Christum hominibus parta; γ. futura Christianorum felicitas; δ. *religio Christiana* s. cœtus, societas Christianorum, in his terris; ζ. imperium spirituale et invisibile, quo Christus cœtum sectatorum suorum in his terris tuetur et anget, suamque doctrinam indies magis magisque propagat; η propagatio religionis Christianæ; θ. regnum Christi terrenum.

ponding Syriack term, sometimes signifies a rock as well as a stone. But the word is changed ; and therefore we may conclude, that the second term was not meant to convey the same meaning, as the first. It has a relative meaning, no doubt. Simon was with great propriety called Petrus for his confession of that doctrine, on which Christ was to build his Church. " Thou art Peter, and I have so called you, because on the doctrine, which you have now confessed, I will build my Church as on a rock." The solidity of a Rock is an emblem of the eternal stability of the Gospel and its covenant. The Gospel is an " everlasting Gospel." The covenant of grace is an " everlasting covenant." Heaven and earth shall pass away, but " the words of Christ shall not pass away."

The *Church* of Christ is one thing, the *foundation* of the Church, another ; and the *Rock*, on which it is founded, another. The foundation of the Church is the testimony of the Prophets and Apostles ; and Christ, the subject of this testimony, is the Rock on which it is founded. But the *foundation* and the *Rock* are convertible terms ; and therefore Christ may be called the foundation ; and the testimony of the Apostles, the rock on which the Church is built. But, individually, Christ, and not St. Peter, is the rock of the Christian Church.

The Christian Church, in a general sense, is a society of believers in Christ. All members of Christ's Church are believers in Christ, but all believers in Christ are not members of Christ's Church.* The

* To believe in Christ is not, of itself, sufficient to constitute

Apostles and Prophets are the foundation of a Christian's faith. (Eph. ii. 20.) Christ also is the foundation: "for other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." The Apostles and Prophets are the foundation; and Christ is the ground, the rock, on which the foundation is laid.

Christ is our spiritual rock.* "Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."† The words immediately preceding this passage are remarkable, as applying to the Church of Rome, as well as of Corinth. "According to the grace of God, which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation." There was a Church at Rome some years before St. Paul went there, consisting, probably, of his converts, with whom he must have had intercourse by letters before the receipt of the Epistle, which is in our possession. He writes to them with a warmth and interest, and anxiety to see them, which are very suitable to a church of his own foundation. "To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints: Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and

any one a member of Christ's Church. He must be admitted to the Church according to Christ's own will and ordinance; that is, he must believe and be baptized; he must be baptized not only with the Spirit, but with water; he must be baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; he must be baptized by persons duly authorized. Christ gave his first commission, not to all the disciples, but to the Apostles alone.

* 1 Cor. x. 4. † 1 Cor. iii. 11.

the Lord Jesus Christ. First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole word. For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the Gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers; making request, (if by any means now at length I might have a prosperous journey by the will of God) to come unto you. For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be *established*; that is, that I may be comforted together with you, by the mutual faith both of you and me. Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, (but was let hitherto) that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles.”*

The Church of Rome was *established* as a Christian society, during St. Paul's first visit, by the communication of the spiritual gift, which he intimates. It is evident that no other of the Apostles had any share in this first establishment, but St. Paul, whatever may be said of St. Peter's episcopacy of twenty-five years. For the Epistle to the Romans appears to have been written not long before the Apostle's first visit. And at that time his language to them certainly implies that no other Apostle had been there before him. “Yea, so have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named lest I should build upon another man's foundation.” (Ch. xv. 20.) There

* Rom. i. 7—13.

is no evidence in the Acts of the Apostles, or in St. Peter's own epistles, that he *ever* was at Rome; and some learned men, and among them Salmasius, maintain that St. Peter never was there. It is more probable, however, that he *never* was at Rome till the year of his martyrdom.*

The first appointment of a Bishop of Rome seems to have been an act of the joint authority of St. Paul and St. Peter. For so Irenæus the disciple of Polycarp, asserts: Θεμελιωσαντες ουν και οikοδομησαντες οι μακαριοι Αποστολοι την εκκλησιαν Δινω την της επισκοπης λειτουργιαν ενχειρησαν, *the blessed Apostles having founded and built the church of Rome, committed the charge of its government to Linus*. He mentions the two Apostles by name in another place: του Πέτρου και του Παυλου εν Ρωμη ευαγγελιζομενων και θεμελιων την εκκλησιαν.†

But this establishment of the Church of Rome was long subsequent to that of the Church of Jerusalem. That the words of our Saviour were not meant to convey any supremacy to St. Peter, is evident not only from St. Paul's not acknowledging such supremacy in his communication with his Roman converts, but also from the steps, which, were taken by the Apostles in the establishment of the Christian Church. The first Christian Church was not at Rome but at Jerusalem; the president of the

* See the *Testimonia de prima Ecclesiae Romane fundatione*, in the preceding *Advertisement*, p. 312; and Stillingfleet's *Orig. Br.* p. 48.

† Pearson de Annis priorum Romæ Episcoporum. Cap. 11.

first Christian Council was not St. Peter but St. James; and the first Christian Bishop was St. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem. I conclude therefore, *first*, that our Saviour's words do not mean that the Church should be founded on St. Peter; *secondly*, that it was not so founded—but on the *Messiahship of Jesus*, the doctrine, which St. Peter had confessed; and *thirdly*, that St. Paul, and not St. Peter was the first founder of the Church of Rome.

II. St. Paul was not only the founder of the Church of Rome, but of the Church in Britain. Of St. Paul's journey to Britain, a point of great importance in the history of the Gospel, and of the Protestant Church, we fortunately possess as substantial evidence as any historical fact can require. But though Usher and Stillingfleet* have collected the most unquestionable authorities for it, it seems not to have acquired, generally, that degree of historical credit to which it is entitled. It deserves therefore, on many accounts, to be brought more home to us as a part of our national history;† and as such, I have

* Mr. Nelson has given in his excellent work on the Feasts and Fasts of the Church, a summary of Bishop Stillingfleet's observations on this subject; and Collier, in his Ecclesiastical History, has adopted the whole discussion. Bishop Gibson, in his Notes on Camden's Britannia, concurs with Bishop Stillingfleet.

† An inquiry into the evidences of the foundation of the British Church by St. Paul, is rendered the more necessary by the defective statement of them in a late very learned Analysis of Chronology; of which statement an account is given at the end of this Inquiry.

endeavoured to make all the use of it I could in the discourse, which I lately delivered to you at Carmarthen.

Some of our most valuable ecclesiastical historians have no scruple in acceding to the general testimony of the Fathers, that the Gospel was preached in Britain by some of the Apostles soon after the middle of the first century, but shrink from the particular evidences of time and person, as fables, which would discredit the dignity and accuracy of history. In which caution there is more, perhaps, to regret than to censure. They are unwilling to affect the general credit of their narratives by the admission of particulars, however interesting, which they think they cannot substantiate. But unfortunately they reject the probable on account of the improbable. And in this rejection, it is certainly much to be regretted, that they have given some advantage to the advocates of popery and infidelity; to the former by the suppression of evidences, which disprove the right of supremacy in the Church of Rome; and to the latter, by withdrawing some strong and tangible proofs of the truth of Christianity.

Gildas says that Christianity was introduced into Britain *before* the defeat of the British forces under Boadicia, (A. D. 61) and *between* that event, and some others not long preceding it. He has just mentioned this defeat, and then adds; "*In the mean while* the sun of the Gospel *first* enlightened this island, which displayed his bright beams to the whole world,

as we know, in the latter part of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar.* In the 20th or 21st of Tiberius the Apostles received their commission to preach the Gospel to all the world.

Eusebius affirms, that the Gospel was preached in Britain by some of the Apostles. Other ancient historians expressly say this of St. Paul. In the before-mentioned Discourse I have endeavoured to prove, that we are indebted to St. Paul for the first preaching of the Gospel in Britain; and founded this proof on Eusebius's and Jerome's testimony, that St. Paul was sent prisoner to Rome in the second year of Nero, that is, in the year 56. The family of Caractacus, who were sent as hostages with him in the year 51,† were still at Rome; for we are informed by an ancient British record,‡ that Caractacus's father accompanied his son, as an hostage, and

* *Interea glaciali frigore rigenti insulæ (et veluti longiore terrarum recessu soli visibili non proximæ) verus ille (non de firmamento Sol temporali sed de summa etiam colorum arce tempora cuncta excedente) universo orbi præfulgidum sui coruscum ostendens tempore, ut scimus, summo Tiberii Cæsaris (quo absque ullo impedimento ejus propagabatur Religio comminata senatu nolente a Principe morte dilatoribus militum ejusdem,) radios suos primum indulget, id est, sua præcepta Christus. (Gildæ Epist.)* This passage was misunderstood by Camden, Usher, Simson, and others; but is well explained by Stillingfleet in his *Origenes Britannicæ*. See a further account of this passage in the *Postscript* to this Letter.

† Tacitus, *Annal.* l. XII.

‡ *Myvyrian Archæology*, Vol. II. p. 63. Triad 35. The passage is translated in Williams's *Dissertation on the Pelagian Heresy*, p. 14, and in the *Appendix to Roberts's Collection of Cambridge*, p. 202.

returned to Britain after staying at Rome seven years, that is, till the year 68, and brought with him the knowledge of the Christian faith. This family, I conclude, that St. Paul either accompanied in their return to Britain, or followed them after he had visited Spain.

The practicability of St. Paul's journey to Britain, within the period mentioned by Gildas, depends, in a considerable degree, on the year of his first going to Rome; and that, again, on the recall of Felix from the government of Judea. To St. Paul's first journey to Rome different dates are assigned by different writers: the

2d of Nero by Eusebius

A.D. 56.

Jerome

Freulphus

Ivo*

Hist. Eccl. Magdeb.

Petavius

Stillingfleet

Cave (Hist. Lit.)

Simson †

A.D. 57. ~~57~~

4th

Calvisius

A.D. 58. ~~58~~

Usher (Antiq.)

A.D. 58. ~~58~~

5th

Beausobre

A.D. 59. ~~59~~

6th

Pearson

A.D. 60. ~~60~~

9th

Usher (Annal.)

A.D. 63. ~~63~~

* Imperii sui (Neronis) anno secundo Festum Judææ procuratorem fecit. *Chronicon Ivonis apud Corpus Francicæ Historiæ Veteris*, p. 28. *Hanoviae* 1614.

† Simson says *secundo Neronis anno*, though he dates it A.D. ~~60~~ LVII.

Of these dates,* the two last which are adopted by our very learned Chronologists, are most at variance with the testimony of Gildas. For if St. Paul had gone to Rome so late as the year 60, (as he staid there two years according to St. Luke) he would not have reached Britain till after the defeat of Boadicea, and would have found the country under all the horrors of devastation and oppression,† and in a state very unfavourable to the reception of the Gospel, especially by the mission of a Roman citizen.‡ The first of these dates (2d of Nero) not only accords with Gildas's testimony, and with the residence of Caractacus's family, and other favourable contingencies, at Rome, but has the authority of Eusebius and Jerome, and the concurrence of Stillingfleet in his *Origenes Britannicæ*, and which is of great consequence in adjusting the chronology of St. Paul's ministry,) it affords sufficient time for St. Paul's various journies and labours in the West and East before his return to Rome.

But still the date of St. Paul's first journey to

* The great diversity of dates assigned to the same events in St. Paul's ministry, (his *first* visit to Rome, his *return*, and his *death*;) seems to have been occasioned in no small degree by the omission of so material a portion of that Ministry, as the Apostle's journey to the West.

† Before the defeat of Boadicea the Britons had destroyed seventy or eighty thousand Romans. At least as many Britons perished in the victory which followed; and hostilities were on both sides carried on for some years, with unusual cruelties.

‡ Acts xxi. 39.

Rome depends on the time of Felix's recall. The ascertaining of one would decide the other. It is very improbable that Felix should continue in the government of Judea after his brother, Pallas, had been removed from the administration of affairs at Rome, which was in the 2d year of Nero. How dependent Felix was on his brother's power is evident from Tacitus. "At non frater ejus (Pallantis) cognomento Felix pari moderatione agebat, jampridem Judææ impositus, et cuncta malefacta sibi impune ratus, *tanta potentia subnixo.*" (Annal. L. XII.) But an expression of Josephus respecting the pardon of Felix, has induced the very learned author of *Annales Paulini* to place his recall four years later. Josephus says that Felix would have been punished for his delinquencies, if Nero had not pardoned him at the intercession of Pallas. But Pallas was removed from the administration of government in the 2d year of Nero, and therefore, it may be supposed, must, at that time, have lost all influence with the Emperor; and that he could not have recovered it till after the death of Agrippina. Post Agrippinæ cædem nulla Pallantis apud Neronem offensio memoratur.—Quidni igitur sexto Neronis anno jam exeunte, tanta Pallas apud eum gratia floreret, ut fratrem suum, quem Nero ipse Procuratorem fecerat, a paucis Judæis accusatum liberaret.

The recall of Felix would have been almost a necessary consequence of Pallas's disgrace, if he was

not recalled before. But how should Pallas in disgrace obtain the pardon of his brother? To this we may reply, that if Pallas had lost his influence with Nero, Agrippina had not yet lost her power, and therefore could easily have secured the pardon of her favourite's brother. Even three years after this, Nero was *alienis jussis obnoxius*, (as Poppæa told him to irritate his pride) and *non modo imperii, sed libertatis etiam indigebat*. This was, no doubt, the language of artifice and exaggeration; but it shews the power of Agrippina; which is further evident from the expression of Tacitus on the occasion: *cunctis cupientibus infringi matris potentiam*. Felix's pardon, therefore, did not require so remote a cause, as the recovery of Pallas's influence over Nero. Though the pardon of Felix was, probably, the effect of Agrippina's power, it was, no doubt, procured by the intercession of Pallas: for Agrippina was *ad Pallantis libita provoluta*. Josephus, who wrote his history forty years after the beginning of Nero's reign,* might perhaps have mistaken the cause of his pardon; and have imputed that to Pallas's intercession with Nero, which was obtained by his influence over Agrippina. That he was sometimes mistaken in Roman transactions and characters of that day, we are sure from his calling Poppæa a religious woman, (θεοσεβης γαρ ην) who, beside her other delinquencies,

* It was finished in the xiiith year of Domitian, and the fifty-sixth of his own age.

instigated Nero to the murder of his mother, and his wife Octavia.*

* The language of Josephus seems to have led to a supposition that the Empress Poppæa was one of St Paul's converts, one of "the Saints of Cæsar's household." Cave notices the supposition in his life of St. Paul, and Dr. Hales thinks it probable (Chronol. Vol. II. p. 1252.) I wish there were sufficient evidence for it. There is no difficulty in the supposition that St Paul's preaching had power to awaken the greatest sinner to repentance; and Poppæa's conscience was accessible through all the avenues of adultery, murder, and atrocious cruelty. But there is no ground for the supposition of her conversion, that I can find except the account, which Chrysostom gives of St. Paul's having persuaded one of Nero's concubines to renounce her connection with Nero (*της ακαθαρτου συνουσιας απαλλαγηναι*) and that in consequence of this conversion Nero commanded St. Paul to be put to death. The account does not say, that the Empress was converted, but one of Nero's concubines. If therefore Poppæa was converted at all, it must have been when she lived in the latter character. And had she been then converted to a chaste and virtuous life, we may, I think, venture to assert, that no convert of St Paul, under all the convictions of sin, and compunctions of repentance, which his preaching must have excited, would ever have consented to marry Nero. But the concubine Poppæa was afterwards the wife of Nero, and the instigator to the murder of Octavia.

The character, which Josephus gives of Poppæa has no countenance from Tacitus, who was her contemporary as well as Josephus. He says of her, *Huic mulieri cuncta alia fuere præter honestum animum*. She could not have been a convert before marriage, for she continued in her adulterous intercourse with Nero till her marriage in the year 62. And if we may judge from Tacitus there was nothing in her conduct after her marriage with Nero to justify the supposition that her mind had experienced any religious change; for he thus speaks of her death

But Felix might have been recalled from the government of Judea before Pallas was dismissed from

Mortem Poppææ, ut palam tristem, ita recordantibus lætam ob impudicitiam ejus sævitiamque. He does not say that she was ever accused or suspected of "foreign superstition," which he would have done, if there had been any report of her being a convert to Christianity. Speaking of the death of Octavia, he says, *Poppæa non nisi in perniciem uxoris nupta.—Additurque atrocior sævitia, quod caput amputatum latumque per urbem Poppæa vidit.* This was the commencement of Poppæa's imperial life. The year before her death, Gessius Florus, the most tyrannical and rapacious of all the governors of Judea, obtained the government through the interest of his wife Cleopatra, who was the friend of Poppæa. And of this friend Josephus gives a very bad character. He calls her οὐδὲν ποτὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ (Φλωροῦ) διαφερούσαν, as wicked as her husband. Such a woman was not likely to be the friend of one of St. Paul's converts.

Josephus, however, calls Poppæa θεοσεβής. To gratify her, Nero pardoned the Jews, who had raised a building to obstruct the views of Agrippa's palace, which overlooked the Temple; and afterwards at Josephus's solicitation she obtained the release of the Jewish Priests, who had been sent prisoners to Rome by Felix. Josephus very gratefully ascribes these favours to her piety, which are more justly imputable to political caprice. Agrippina and her friends had oppressed the Jews. Poppæa of course favoured and protected them. These favours were done the Jews during the most iniquitous period of her life, the latter in the first year of her marriage with Nero, and the former about four years before.

The time assigned to this conversion by Chrysostom is a decisive proof that the convert was not Poppæa. It was after St. Paul's return to Rome, and just before his death. If the Apostle suffered martyrdom in the year 65, according to Dr Hales, Poppæa was then *Empress*, and not one of Nero's concubines. If he died in the year 68, according to Eusebius, Jerome, Sillingfleet, and Pearson, Poppæa at that time had been dead three years, according to Tacitus. (Annal. L. XVI.)

his office by Nero; and perhaps the language of Josephus implies that he was: for he says, that Nero pardoned Felix, when Pallas was high in his favour, or was *most in favour with him*: τότε δὲ *μαλιστα διατιμης εχων εκεινον*: words, which designate a very early part of Nero's reign, rather than a late. For Pallas was dismissed from power in the second year; was tried for high treason in the third; and must have continued out of favour with Nero till the death of Agrippina in the 5th or 6th year. In the 8th year he was put to death: the same year in which Nero married Poppæa. And there was no part of the interval between Agrippina's death and his own, to which the *μαλιστα διατιμης εχων* can apply. For though the death of Agrippina might have allayed Nero's hatred of Pallas, there was in the new interests nothing likely to restore his influence, or to favour his brother. If therefore Felix was recalled when Pallas was *most in favour*, or very high in favour, with Nero, it must have been early in the second or in the first year of Nero.

Other reasons * are given for the duration of Felix's government to a later period than the second of Nero, founded on the age of Josephus, who was born in the first year of Caligula, A.D. 36. When he was six and twenty years old (as he informs us in his Life,) he went to Rome to procure the release of some Jewish priests, who had been sent prisoners to Rome by Felix. The priests were released in the year 62; and therefore (it is argued) Felix was not

* Hales's new Analysis of Chronology, Vol. II. p. 1112.

deposed till the year 61. The priests might have been detained in prison till the year 62,* (from rigour or neglect,) but it does not therefore follow, that Felix continued in his government till the year immediately preceding their release. There was, probably, no access to imperial favour on their account during the life-time of Agrippina. Josephus obtained their release by the intercession of the new empress, Poppæa, to whom he was introduced by a Jewish actor of the lowest kind, who was a favourite of Nero.

The commencement of Felix's government seems to have been another reason with the learned and excellent Bishop of Chester, for dating his recall so late as the year 60. He says in the passage before quoted, that Nero appointed Felix governor of Judea. If Felix had commenced his government of Judea under Nero, its duration would require a date as late as that assigned in the *Annales*. But it is clear from the Annals of Tacitus (Lib. XII.) that he was appointed governor by Claudius some years before the emperor's death.† And it is equally clear that Claudius's appointment had not been overlooked by

* The time of Josephus's journey is defined both by the age of Josephus, and by the intercession of Poppæa, (*Καίσαρος γυναικίς*) who was not married to Nero till the year 62.

† Fausto Sylla, Sylvio Othone Coss.—(A. D. 52.)--Felix jampridem Judææ impositus.—Ventidio Cumano pars provinciæ habebatur, ita divisio, ut huic Galilæorum natio, Felici Samaritæ parerent.—Damnatusque flagitiorum, quæ duo deliquerant, Cumanus, et quies provinciæ reddita. (Tacitus, *Annal.* Lib. XII.)

the author of the *Annales* : for he says, (A.D. 53. Claud. 13.) *Felix a Claudio Procurator Judææ rursus factus est.* The *first* appointment is dated A.D. 48. Claud. 8, which was to the province of Samaria.*

The words of St. Paul in his defence before Felix : “ forasmuch as I know, that thou hast been of *many years* a judge unto this nation :” which were spoken on the first apprehension of St. Paul, and two years before the recall of Felix ; certainly imply a long duration of Felix’s government ; but it was a duration that preceded the first years of Nero, and not that followed them ; as we may collect from the language of Tacitus, who speaking of Felix in the year 52, expresses himself not unlike the Apostle : “ *jampridem* Judææ impositus.” Whether *jampridem* means *long since*, or *some time since*,† that which was *jampridem* in 52 might well be called *ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν* in 54. If Felix had been governor of Judea from the year 48, according to Petavius,

M. Asinio, M. Acilio Coss.—(A.D. 54)—*Claudius veneno tollitur.* (Annal. Lib. XII.)

* The two provinces of Galilee and Samaria appear to have been included under the common title of the province of Judea : for Tacitus after speaking of Felix, as *jampridem* Judææ impositus, and of Cumanus, to whom *pars provinciæ* habebatur, says the province was divided between them, one having Galilee, and the other Samaria.

† Beausobre translates, “ *jampridem*,” *déjà long-temps*, (Nouveau Testament, Vol. II. p. xxix.) and Stillingfleet, *a long time*.

and according to the first date in the *Annales*,* he might justly be said to have been “many years a judge,” especially if it be considered, that out of fourteen governors of Judea, from the Procurator Coponius, A. D. 6, to Gessius Florus, A. D. 64,† the governments of eleven were of less duration than that of Felix, five of the eleven lasting only one year, and three only two. There is therefore nothing in the words of St. Paul, that requires an extension of the government of Felix to a later year than the second of Nero; and there are many reasons against it.

There is another argument for the duration of Felix’s government, in the *Annales Paulini*, depending also on the age of Josephus, but which appears to be not well founded. “Josephus post annum ætatis XXVI Romam navigat, ut sacerdotes quosdam sibi familiares, quos Felix vinctos Romam miserat, liberaret. Romam autem illos miserat ineunte anno LX, cum jam annum ageret Josephus XXIII, et inter eum et hos Sacerdotes familiaritas intercesserat per ferme quadriennium: unde duratio Felicis in officio Procuratoris optime confirmatur. Nam si sub initio Imperii Neronis, ut volunt, hi Sacerdotes a Felice missi fuissent, familiares Josephi dici non poterant. Tunc enim ipse vix expleverat annum ætatis XVIII, et tunc in deserto vixit cum Bano

* The first appointment of Felix, mentioned by Pearson, is in the year 48, not 52, as mentioned by Dr. Hales, Chronol. Vol. II. p. 1111.

† See Hales’s Chronology, Vol. II. 657.

quodam, quocum ibi versatus est *ab anno ætatis sue XVI per triennium.* (pag. 329.) The priests, who were sent to Rome by Felix, are called by Josephus his intimate friends (συνήθεις); but “they could not have been so called, it is here alleged, if they had been sent to Rome in the beginning of Nero’s reign; for Josephus had then scarce completed his XVIIth year, and was in the desert with Banus for three years from the age of sixteen.”

As Josephus was educated for the priesthood, I can see no reason, why he might not even before the age of eighteen have lived in habits of intimacy and friendship with these priests; under the most ordinary circumstances of a religious education. But the extraordinary learning and premature attainments of Josephus render such intimacy not only probable, but almost unavoidable. He says in his Life,* that “when he was only fourteen years old,

* Ἐτι δ’ ἀρα παῖς ὢν, περὶ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκατον ἔτος, διὰ το φιλο-
γραμματον ὑπο παντων ἐπηνουμην, συνιόντων αἰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν
τῆς πόλεως πρώτων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ παρ’ ἐμοῦ περὶ τῶν νομιμῶν ἀκριβεστέρον τι
γινῶναι. Περὶ ἐκκαίδεκα δὲ ἔτη γενόμενος ἐβκυληθὴν τῶν παρ’ ἡμῖν αἵρε-
σεων ἐμπειρίαν λαβεῖν. Τρεῖς δ’ εἰσιν αὗται, Φαρισαίων μὲν ἡ πρώτη,
καὶ Σαδδουκαίων ἡ δευτέρα, τρίτη δὲ ἡ Ἑσσηνῶν, καθὼς πολλακίς εἶπαμεν.
Οὕτως γὰρ νόμῳ αἵρεσεσθαι τὴν ἀρίστην, εἰ πάσας καταμαθοίμεν.
Σκληραγωγῇ σὰς γούν ἐμαυτὸν, καὶ πολλὰ πεπονθὼς, τὰς τρεῖς διηλ-
θον. Καὶ μὴδὲ τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἐμπειρίαν ἱκανὴν ἐμαυτῷ νομισάς εἶναι, πνι-
θόμενος τινὰ Βαγουν ὄνομα κατὰ τὴν ἐρημίαν διατρίβειν, ἐσθῆτι μὲν ἀπο
δανδρῶν χρωμένον, τροφὴν δὲ τὴν αὐτοματῶς φύομένην προσφερομένον,
ψυχρῷ δὲ ὕδατι τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν νύκτα πολλακίς λουόμενον πρὸς
ἀγνείαν, ζήλωτις ἐγενομένη αὐτοῦ, καὶ διατρίψας παρ’ αὐτῷ σνιαυτοῦς

his ardent love of learning had gained him the praise of all men; and that, at that early age, the high priests, and other chief persons of the city, resorted to him for advice and accurate information on questions of the law. At the age of sixteen he devoted himself to the study of the three sects, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes. For three years he attended the instructions, and followed the ascetick discipline, of Banus in the Desert, and then returned to the city. At the age of XIX†

τρεῖς, καὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τελειώσας, εἰς τὴν πόλιν ὑπεστρέφον. Ἐνθα-
μαυδεῖα δ' ἔτη ἔχων, ἠρξάμην τε πολιτευέσθαι τῇ Φαρισαίων αἵρεσι
κατακολουθῶν.—(*Josephi Vita*, §. 2.)

† Josephus was three years with Banus in the Desert. If the whole three years from the age of sixteen had passed in the Desert, he must have returned to the city at the age of XIX. But this whole time was clearly not passed in the Desert. The study of the Sects was one thing, the ascetick philosophy of Banus, another. The former was cultivated in the city, the latter in the Desert. How long he was employed in the study of the Sects, is not expressed. But he seems, successively, to have attended the schools of the three Sects, τὰς τρεῖς διηλθόν. He could not well have employed less than two years in this study. He then went for further instructions to Banus, with whom he remained three years. Allowing then two years to one study, and three to the other, he would return to the city from the Desert at XXI years of age, a more probable time for him to commence his public life (ἠρξάμην πολιτευέσθαι) than the age of XIX. Josephus, indeed, was an extraordinary youth, and therefore might have commenced his political life earlier than other young men. But he could not have been with Banus from the age of XVI consistently with any adequate allowance of time for the study of the Sects; and therefore he could not have returned to the city at XIX, even if only one year be allotted to

(if the present reading be right) he attached himself to the sect of the Pharisees." Such is Josephus's own account of himself.

Whatever allowances may be made for the vanity of a biographer, who writes the history of his own life, we cannot deduct so much from the letter of this account as to make it at all surprising that such a young man as Josephus, should have had intimate friends among the Jewish priests long before the age of eighteen, at which age he was with Banus in the desert, whether he was there from sixteen to nineteen, or from eighteen to one and twenty.

In the preceding passage of the *Annales* it is said; that "Romam illos miserat ineunte anno LX." If the Priests had been sent to Rome by Felix, in the beginning of the year LX, that would determine the duration of his government and supersede all further inquiry. But I find no authority in Josephus for that date; and can therefore ascribe it only to conjecture, especially as Usher assigns the same event to the year LXII. Both appear to have adopted the date most consistent with their other calculations of the chronology of St. Paul's ministry.

It is impossible to have any other feelings, but those of respect and admiration for the incomparable author of the *Exposition of the Creed*; and if I have ventured to controvert the grounds of some of the dates in his *Annales Paulini*, it has been not merely that study: $16-1-3=20$. The terms *καταμαδοιμι—σκληραγωγησας—πολλα πεπονθας*—and *τας τρεις διηλθον*, imply a longer portion of time than one year.

because I thought them erroneous, but because they interfere with a portion of St. Paul's ministry, which has been too much overlooked in the arrangements of ecclesiastical chronology ; but which, nevertheless, is of supreme importance to the evidences of Christianity and of the Protestant Church.

Dating then the recall of Felix from the period of his brother's removal from his office in the 2nd year of Nero, or from the year immediately preceding it, we obtain a point of time for St. Paul's first journey to Rome, which accords with the testimony of Eusebius and Jerome, and is consistent with Gildas's narrative, was peculiarly favourable for the Apostle's journey to Britain, after his two years imprisonment at Rome, and, moreover, afforded sufficient time for his labours and journies in the West and East, before his return to Rome.

St. Paul's journey to Britain, perhaps requires a new adjustment of the dates of some of his epistles. *Sed de hoc viderint Interpretes.*

In Dr. Hales's learned, elaborate, and valuable *Analysis of Chronology*, the time of St. Paul's *first journey to Rome* is considered as a prominent and fundamental date in the apostle's Ministry, and his *journey to Britain* is not unnoticed ; but the judgment of the *Analysis* respecting the time of one journey, and the probability of the other, varies too much from the conclusions of the preceding pages for me to omit the mention of so material a difference.

The *Analysis* places St. Paul's first arrival at

Rome in the Spring of the year 62, and his martyrdom in the year 65,* allowing only one year between the two imprisonments. So short an interval as one year is quite inconsistent with the evidence which we have of his journeys to Spain and Britain, and to the East.

But the accounts which have been handed down to us of St. Paul's *western* journeys, though resting on the contemporary authority of one of the Apostolical Fathers, Dr. Hales thinks there is great reason to doubt.† The *first* reason objected is, that his

* Vol. II. p. 1113. Paul sent Prisoner to Rome.... A. D. 61.

Arrived.....early in ..A. D. 62.

Liberated about the end of..... A. D. 63:

Returned to Rome about the close

of..... A. D. 64.

Suffered martyrdom..... A. D. 65.

† “ When Paul wrote his epistle to the Romans, announcing his intention of visiting them, previous to his last journey to Jerusalem, he designed to have proceeded from Italy, to preach the Gospel in Spain, Rom. xv. 23—28. Clemens Romanus also expressly asserts that he preached in the *west*, and that to its *utmost bounds*, which must at least include Spain. Epist. 1 ad Cor. ch. 5. And Theodoret adds, that he went to the islands of the sea, and numbers Gaul and Britain among the disciples of the tentmaker. But there is great reason to doubt these reports : for (1.) his long imprisonments of four years at Cæsarea and at Rome, must have broken his measures and circumscribed his travels. (2.) The interval between his first and second visit to Rome, seems to have been too short for a visit to Syria eastwards, and afterward in an opposite direction, to Spain and Britain, the extremities of Europe westwards. (3.) There is no notice taken of these western travels in Paul's last Epistle to Timothy, but only of his eastern. (4.) An ancient Greek writer

long imprisonments must “ have broken his measures and circumscribed his travels.” The measures of an ordinary traveller might have been broken by such obstacles; but the Apostle of the Gentiles, who was under the special protection of Providence, and was disposed to “ labour more abundantly than all the Apostles,” was not likely to be disconcerted by common difficulties. There was besides a most favourable conjuncture of circumstances at Rome, sufficient to encourage a much less zealous missionary than St. Paul. There were resident at Rome between the years 51 and 58 some British hostages from the family of Caractacus, and two illustrious ladies, Pomponia Græcina, and Claudia Rufina, who were natives of Britain, and converts to Christianity.

2. Dr. Hales’s *second* reason for doubting the accounts of St. Paul’s journey to Britain, is, that the interval between his first and second visit to Rome seems to have been too short to afford time for a visit to Syria, and afterwards to Spain and Britain. The space of one year assigned by him to this interval is obviously much too short even for the western journeys alone; but that is an argument

the travels of St. Peter and St. Paul, observes that “ Peter *some days* in Britain, and enlightened many by the gift of grace; and having established churches and elected elders, Presbyters, and Deacons, came again to Rome. in the reign of Nero, A.D. 65. This *ancient* account is highly proper. 1252.—Clemens speaks rather rhetorically of St. Paul’s journey to the western extremity of Europe,” p. 1256. (A new History of Chronology, Vol. II.)

against the system, which contracts this interval within such narrow limits as to exclude the western journies, rather than against the journies themselves. If we admit the testimony of Eusebius and Jerome, that St. Paul was sent prisoner to Rome in the second year of Nero, and suffered martyrdom in the fourteenth year, the space between A.D. 58, the year of his release, and A.D. 67 or 68, the time of his return, will be sufficient for the Apostle's various labours in the West and East. To this interval Godeau allows eight years. Baronius, Massutius, Simson, and Stillingfleet, somewhat more; the *Historia Ecclesiastica Magdeburgica*, ten years.

3. Dr. Hales's *third* objection to the western travels of St. Paul, is, that "there is no notice taken of these travels in St. Paul's second Epistle to Timothy, but only of his eastern." It will be a sufficient answer to this negative objection, to observe that St. Peter, in his Epistles, takes no notice of *his* western travels, yet our learned Chronologist thinks it "highly probable" that St. Peter travelled to Britain, on the *single* authority of a writer of the *tenth* century. In proof of St. Paul's travels to the West and Britain we have a continued series of testimonies from the *first* century to the *sixth*, but we hear nothing of St. Peter's western labours till *four* centuries after the latest testimonies for St. Paul. The *tenth* century was an age of forgery and interpolation, and of such devotion to the Roman apostolical chair, that we cannot be surprised,

that, in any narrative of that day, the merits of St. Paul should be transferred to St. Peter.

4. Dr. Hales's *fourth* reason is stated thus: "An *ancient* Greek * writer of the travels of St. Peter and St. Paul, observes that St. PETER spent *some days* in Britain, and enlightened many by the word of grace; and having established churches, &c." If this writer were ever so ancient, and the account which he gives of St. Peter ever so true, it would not disprove what others assert of St. Paul. - But this writer is far from being an *ancient* writer, compared with the time of the fact which he is brought to attest. A writer of the tenth century is entitled to no credit, if he is contradicted, or not supported, by the authority of more ancient writers.

Of the authority of this writer, Bishop Stillingfleet gives the following judgment. "Some writers of our Church History have endeavoured to prove St. Peter to have preached the Gospel in Britain; but their proofs are very slight and inconsiderable, and depend chiefly on the authority of *Simeon Metarastes*, or other legendary writers, or some monk-visions, or some domestick testimonies of his pretended successors, or some late partial advocates, such as Eysengrenius, who professes to follow *Metarastes*. All which together, are not worth mentioning in comparison with the authors on the other

see the passages quoted by Junius in his notes on Clemens's ; and in Le Clerc's edition of Cotelerius's *Patres Apostolici* vol. i. p. 150, n. 8. and referred to by Cave in his *Life of St. Peter*, p. 81.

side."* If to this protestant judgment we add the opinions of two Roman Catholick writers, one pronouncing Metaphrastes to be of "no authority in these matters;"† and the other calling him "a treacherous authority,"‡ we shall not be disposed to allow him any credit either in support of St. Peter's journey to Britain or against St. Paul's.

The testimonies of the first six centuries, which either expressly record St. Paul's journey to the West and to Britain, or afford such evidence of the propagation of Christianity in Spain and Britain, as coincides with these testimonies, I will give in as few words, as possible.

1. The first and most important is the testimony of Clemens Romanus, "the intimate friend and fellow-labourer of St. Paul." He says, that St. Paul, in preaching the Gospel, went to the *utmost bounds of the West*, ἐπὶ τὰ τέρμα τῆς δυσείας. This is not a rhetorical expression, as Dr. Hales supposes, but the usual designation of Britain. Catullus calls Britain, *ultima Britannia*, and *ultima occidentis insula*. The West included Spain, Gaul, and Britain. Theodoret speaks of the inhabitants of Spain, Gaul, and Britain, as dwelling in the *utmost bounds of the West*, τὰς τῆς ἐσπερας ἐσχάτας. The connection between Britain and the West, will be seen in other passages quoted by Bishop Stillingfleet;§ and in the

* Origenes Britannicæ, p. 45. See also Cave in his Life of St. Peter, p. 34.

† Baronius, A. D. 44. n. 38.

‡ Linguard, Anglo-Saxon Church, vol i. p. 3.

§ Origenes Britan. p. 38.

following of Nicephorus : *προς ἑσπεριον ωκεανον εισβαλων και τας Βρετανικας νησους ευαγγελισαμενος.** *The utmost bounds of the West*, then, is not rhetorical language in itself, for it is a common appellation of Britain ; nor as applied to St. Paul, for it was said of others of the Apostles.

2. In the *second* century (A. D. 179) Irenæus speaks of Christianity as propagated to the utmost bounds of the earth, *ἕως περατων της γης*, by the Apostles, and their disciples ; and particularly specifies the churches planted *εν ταις Ιβηριαις* and *εν Κελτοις*, *in Spain*, and the *Celtick nations*.† By the *Κελτοι* were meant the people of Germany, Gaul, and Britain.‡

3. At the end of the second and the beginning of the *third* century (A. D. 193—220) Tertullian mentions among the Christian converts *Hispaniarum omnes termini, et Galliarum diversæ nationes, et britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero abdita.*§

Though Irenæus and Tertullian, in their testimonies, do not expressly mention St. Paul, yet the conversion of Britain to Christianity is recorded as work of the Apostles and their disciples. It is not interesting to find such writers speaking of its proximity to the origin of the Christian church, consequently of the perfect competency of their

† Hist. L. II. C. 40. apud Usher. Antiq. Eccles. Britan. p. 740.

.. 1. c. 2 & 3.

Pluverii Introd. Geog. L. II. c. 5.

Adversus Judæos, c. 7.

testimony. *Hesterni* sumus, says Tertullian, et vestra omnia adimplevimus, urbes, *insulas*, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurasi, Palatium, Senatum, forum.*

4. In the *fourth* century, (A. D. 270—340) Eusebius says that some of the Apostles “passed over the Ocean to the British isles,” ἐπὶ τὰς ἀνατολικὰς Βρετανίας νησίδας,† and Jerome, in the same century, (A. D. 329—420) ascribes this province expressly to St. Paul, and says that, after his imprisonment, having been in Spain, he went from Ocean to Ocean, and that he preached the Gospel in the *western* parts‡. In the western parts he included Britain, as is evident from a passage in his Epitaphium Marcellæ.§

5. In the *fifth* century, (423—460) Theodoret mentions the Britons among the nations converted by the apostles; and says that St. Paul, after his release from imprisonment, went to Spain, and from thence carried the light of the Gospel to other nations.|| He says also that St. Paul brought salvation to the *Islands that lie in the Ocean*: ¶ ταῖς ἐν τῇ πελάγει διακειμέναις νησὶς τὴν ὠφέλειαν ἀρσσηνέχε. I

* Apologet. c. 37.

† Demonstr. Evang. L. 3. c. 7.

‡ De Script. Eccles. and in Amos c. 5.

§ If the passage be rightly quoted by Camden. “The Britains, who live apart from our world, If they go in pilgrimage, will leave the *western* parts, and seek Jerusalem.” Gibson’s Translation of Camden’s Britannia, p LXX. ed. 1695.

|| In 2 Ep. ad Tim. iv 17.

¶ Tom. 1. in Psalm 116.

there could be any doubt whether the *British Islands* were meant by the *Islands that lie in the Ocean*, we have, besides the passage of Nicephorus before quoted, the following of Chrysostom, who thus describes them : *Και γαρ αἱ Βρετανικαὶ νησοὶ αἱ τῆς θαλάσσης ἐκτὸς κείμεναι, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ οὖσαι τῷ Ὠκεανῷ, τῆς δυνάμει τοῦ ῥήματος ἡσθοντο.**

6. In the *sixth* century, (560—600) Venantius Fortunatus says thus of St. Paul :

*Transit et Oceanum, vel qua facit insula portum,
Quasque Britannus habet terras, quasque ultima Thule.*

This passage has been sometimes hesitatingly admitted, as if verse were necessarily the vehicle of fiction. But that the testimony of Venantius Fortunatus is not to be ascribed to the licence of poetical exaggeration ; and that the language of Clemens, Jerome, and Théodoret is neither ambiguous nor hyperbolical ;† we may judge from an authority, which will not be suspected of making any undue concessions in favour of the evidences of Christianity ; but who was well acquainted with the political facilities, which the Roman empire at that time afforded for the universal propagation of the Gospel. “ The public highways, which had been constructed for the use of the legions, opened an easy passage for the Christian missionaries from Damascus to Corinth, and from Italy to the extremity of Spain or Britain.”‡

* Orat. Tom. 1. p. 575.

† Linguard, Anglo-Saxon Church, Vol. I. p. 3. note 3.

‡ Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Ch. XV. Vol. II. p. 358. 8vo. ed.

To the ancient authorities here cited, we have to add the concurrence of the very learned and judicious modern writers referred to before, p. 321. We may add, further, the testimony of Archbishop Parker ;* *Paulum ipsum Gentium doctorem, cum aliis gentibus, tum nominatim Britannis, nunciasse post priorem suam Romæ incarcerationem, et Theodoretus et Sophronius Patriarcha Hierosolymitanus affirmant. Hoc quod Pontifici incredibile atque adeo impossibile statuunt, cum vero maxime cohæret :* and of Camden ; *Certum est Britannos in ipsa Ecclesiæ infantia Christianam religionem imbibisse ;*† who cites Theodoret and Sophronius and Venantius Fortunatus in testimony of St. Paul's journey to Britain. Cave also in his Life of St. Paul, quotes the same writers, and says, that, by the *Islands that lie in the Ocean*, Theodoret undoubtedly meant Britain. Such strength of ancient and modern authorities ought, if I may judge by my own convictions, to put the subject of St. Paul's preaching the Gospel in Britain, beyond all controversy or doubt.

I have now, Reverend Brethren, shewn, I think, from good historical evidence of ancient authorities, supported by the concurrence of very judicious modern writers, Parker, Camden, Usher, Stillingfleet, Cave, Gibson, Nelson, and Collier, that St. Paul preached the Gospel in Britain. We are further informed that St. Paul appointed the first

* *De Vetustate Ecclesiæ Brit. initio.*

† *Britannia*, p. 40, ed. 1590.

bishop or bishops, and other Ministers of the Church. What Simeon Metaphrastes says erroneously of St. Peter, may be truly said of St. Paul: *Επιμενας τε εν Βρετανια [ἡμερας τινος] και πολλοις τῷ λογῷ φωτισας της χαριτος, εκκλησιας τε συστησαμενος, επισκοπους τε και πρεσβυτερους και διακονους χειροτονησας [δωδεκατω ετει του Καικαρος Νερωνος] αυθις εις Ρωμην παραγινεται.** The Bishop, whom St. Paul is recorded to have appointed, was Aristobulus, who is mentioned in the epistle to the Romans.† By the appointment of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, the *form of church-government was complete*, and the British church, therefore, in a spiritual sense, was fully established. And what results from this establishment of the British Church by St. Paul? This very interesting consequence, that *the Church of Britain was fully established before the Church of Rome*. For Linus, the first Bishop of Rome, was appointed by the joint authority of St. Peter and St. Paul, in the year of their Martyrdom,‡ and therefore after St. Paul's return from Britain.

I have shewn too that the Church of Jerusalem was the mother church of Christendom, that St.

* Apud. Iunium in Cotelerii Patres Apostol. Vol. I. p. 150. That an Apostle should have staid only *some days* [ἡμερας τινος] in Britain, and that in that short time, he should have established Churches, and appointed Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, must be an error. The *twelfth year* of Nero is also an error for the *fourteenth*, which is the date of Eusebius, and Jerome, and Freculphus.

† Usher de Britan. Eccles. Antiq. p. 9, and 744, 745.

‡ Dodwell de Pontificum Romanorum successione, p. 113, 153.

James was the first Bishop of the first Christian Church, that St. Paul was the founder of the Church of Rome, and that the words of our Saviour, from which the Romanists derive their opinion of St. Peter's and the Pope's supremacy, do not mean, that He would found his Church on St. Peter: and that it was not so founded; but on the *Messiahship of Jesus*, the doctrine which St. Peter had confessed; and therefore that the Pope's supremacy has no countenance from Scripture or from history.

And yet is this imaginary supremacy of the Pope, the cause of a political anomaly, not suffered in any other government, but our own. The subjects of no Popish government acknowledge a foreign Protestant authority; it is impossible they should; but it is not more inconsistent with right principles of government, than that the subjects of a Protestant government should acknowledge a foreign Popish authority, independent of their own national government.

The advocates of the Popish claims maintain that they *must* be conceded; for that the Irish discontents cannot be quieted without them; and that the concessions are necessary to the safety and prosperity of the British empire. But in their zeal for the Papists they overlook the Protestant discontents, which must inevitably follow from the grant of the Popish claims. They forget, or they wish us to forget, that the Roman Catholics of Ireland are only a part, about a fifth part, of the whole British community; that the great majority of the empire are

Protestants, whose interests are to be consulted in preference to any subordinate part; and that for the sake of this great majority we have a Protestant government, and Protestant laws, and a Protestant king, who is sworn to maintain inviolate the established Protestant constitution. If there is any danger of a Popish rebellion, which I do not believe, from not granting these claims, there is, surely, much more reason to fear a Protestant rebellion from granting them,—in defence of a religion endeared to Britain by its high apostolical antiquity, and an inheritance of almost eighteen centuries, in comparison with which the Popery of Britain, established for a few centuries after the Norman conquest, was a modern usurpation. Yet Popish writers say, that “the Protestants have dispossessed the Roman Catholicks of their inheritance, and fatten in their seats.” This can be said, and admitted, only in utter ignorance of the history of the British church. The British Church was never theirs but by usurpation. For though our Saxon ancestors were converted to Christianity by Popish missionaries, yet, at that very period, the British Church maintaining herself in the unconquered parts of the island, had subsisted from the days of her first founder, St. Paul, and distinguished herself not only by her opposition to the heresy of Pelagius, but to the corruptions of Popery.*

* The following passage from a Letter of Bishop Davies to Archbishop Parker, contains a very interesting record of the

But it is contended, that the concession of the Popish claims is necessary to the safety and prosperity of the empire. The advocates of the Roman Catholicks, I am persuaded, do them great injustice in thus circumscribing their patriotic services. Are the blessings of the British constitution confined to the highest honours of the country? Has the duty of a British subject any connection with the power of obtaining them? Are not the blessings of the British constitution, in an especial manner, the privileges of the middle and lower orders of society? Is not the protection, which the laws afford them against the power of the oppressor, peculiarly valuable to them in rendering every man's own house or cottage his castle? Protection and obedience are the reciprocal bonds of a just government. The protection and liberty which every subject enjoys, are privileges more than equivalent to any services, which the laws require of him, or which his volun-

sentiments of the British Church. "One notable story was in the Chronicle; howe, after the Saxons conquered, contynewall warre remayned bytwixt the Britayns (then inhabitauntes of the realme) and the Saxons, the Brittayns beyng Christians, and the Saxons pagans, As occasion served, they sometymes treated of peace, and then mette together, and communed together, and dyd eate and drynk together, but after that by the meanes of Austen the Saxons became Christianes in such sort, as Austen had taught them, the Bryttayns wold not after that nether eate nor drynke wyth them, nor yet salute them, bycause they corrupted wyth superstition, ymages and ydolatrie, the true religion of Christe." (19 Martii 1565. Richard Menevens. MS. CXIV. Art. 175. Benet. Coll. Camb.)

tary patriotism can contribute. What are honours compared with the rights of personal liberty? Honours are often liberally conferred by a Nero, a Catherine, or a Napoleon; but personal liberty is the inestimable privilege of a free constitution. There are at this time in the French armies, many general officers who have risen from the ranks; but will a Hollander or a Swiss, to whom such honours are open, say that such a contingency is any compensation for the lost liberties of their country? What did the word COUNTRY used to say, when it vibrated on the feelings of a Swiss? It said every thing that was dear to a child, a parent, a husband, a friend, a freeman. It spoke of all the *dulce & decorum*, which made a Decius devote himself for his country; it spoke gratitude for past protection, and ardent aspirations for his country's everlasting welfare. And is it not very injurious to the brave men, who are now fighting the battles of their country, to suppose, that the thoughts of their country will communicate none of these feelings to Roman Catholics, because they cannot attain to her highest honours? Is it not the cruelest injustice to our country, and to the Roman Catholics themselves, to tell them that their services are all unhonoured and unrewarded,* because a few of the highest ho-

* “What rewards are due?—None: you are Catholics.” A learned and valuable friend will know to what part of his writings I am alluding. I most sincerely respect his exertions in the general cause of literature; but I think his arguments for the Popish claims are local, personal, partial; and very fallacious, because not founded on the principles of the British constitution.

nours and rewards which the constitution can confer, are inaccessible to them on account of their own non-conformity to that constitution? What has raised this country to her present envied and unexampled power? Her incomparable constitution. To the glory of the British arms in the East and in the West we may look for a proof, that the grant of the Popish claims is not necessary to the safety and prosperity of the empire; and that the valour of our armies does not depend on unconstitutional concessions.

The conduct of Sweden affords to the Papists of this empire (not an obsolete example, but) an existing proof of the duty of conformity to the constitution of their own government. The king of Sweden has adopted a Papist for his successor. But the Crown Prince was not admitted to the high post which he holds, till he had abjured Popery and conformed to the Protestant religion. Is the British constitution of less value than the constitution of Sweden? The advocates of the Popish claims must think so, when they complain that the Popish subjects of this empire are wronged, and oppressed, and degraded, because they are not admitted to the highest posts, while they continue papists; while they not only profess a religion inimical* to the Protestant church, but acknowledge a foreign jurisdiction.

The advocates of the Popish claims say, that there is very little difference between Popery and Protest-

* Falkner's *Two Treatises*, p. 141—158 (1684). Roberts's *Review*, p. 13. (1810) *Claims of the Roman Catholics considered*, Ch. VIII. (1812)

antism. But our laws say otherwise; our church articles say otherwise; our history, in bloody and indelible characters, says otherwise.* Again, they maintain that “the tenets of the Roman Catholics are misunderstood and their principles misrepresented.” If they are, it is their own fault; for we take them as we find them in their own recent publications, their catechisms, their pastoral letters, and the instructions for the students of Maynooth College.† But I will not detain you on this subject further than to add, that the concession of the Popish claims is not a narrow question of local interest, or of mere political expediency: it is

A Religious question,

A British question,

A National question,

A Constitutional question;

and that in every one of these views the Papists are already in possession of more than is warranted by the principles of a Protestant government; and therefore that their further claims ought not to be conceded.

I am, Reverend Brethren,

Your faithful and affectionate

Friend and Brother,

T. ST. DAVID'S.

* The difference is abundantly proved in the Tracts mentioned in the following Note.

† The following Tracts are strongly recommended to the reader's perusal: *Charges and Tracts*, by the Bishop of Durham;

POSTSCRIPT.**I.— OF THE ORIGINAL MATERIALS OF CHURCH HISTORY.**

“ We are further informed that St. Paul appointed the first bishop or bishops, and other ministers of

(1811) *Observations on the Roman Catholic Question*, by the Right Honourable Lord Kenyon. (1812). *The Roman Catholic Petition considered*, by the Bishop of Gloucester. (1810) *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln*, by the Bishop of Lincoln. (1812.) *Claims of the Roman Catholics considered with reference to the safety of the established Church and the Rights of Toleration* (1812.) *Remarks on the most Rev. Dr.**'s Catechism revised, enlarged, approved, and recommended by the four R. C. Archbishops of Ireland.* (1810.)

Of the writings of former periods the following are eminently deserving the serious perusal of Papists and Protestants :

1. Juell's Apologia, and his Defence of it.
2. Chillingworth's Religion of Protestants.
3. Barrow on the Pope's Supremacy.
4. Stillingfleet on the Idolatry, Fanaticism, and Schisms of the Church of Rome.
5. Leslie's Case stated between the Churches of Rome and England.

At the end of Leslie's Treatise is the following note :

Books decisive and not answered.

1. Dr. Barrow of the *Pope's Supremacy*, and the *Unity of the Church.* 1680.

2. Dr. Cosin, (since Bishop of Durham) his *Scholastical History of the Canon of the Holy Scripture.* 1657. Concerning the Apocriphal books.

3. His *History of Transubstantiation.* Latin 1657. Eng^l 1676.

4. *The Devotions of the Roman Church*, 1674, concerning Invocation of Saints, of Reliques, and Legends.

Scepticism of the Church of Rome,

the Church in Britain.—The bishop, whom St. Paul is recorded to have appointed, was Aristobulus, who is mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans.” (Letter, p. 347.)

Though the appointment of Aristobulus, as the first bishop in Britain, is not so amply attested as the preaching of St. Paul, yet there is nothing in it contradictory to any recorded circumstances of Aristobulus's life. Such an appointment was a necessary consequence of the establishment of a church in Britain, as is evident from what we know of the steps, which were always taken to perpetuate the Apostolical institutions.

The accounts, which we have of the foundation of Christian churches, and the successions of their chief ministers, were derived from the most authentic sources, the records of facts carefully preserved and transmitted. To the accuracy of these records an appeal was made, as early as the second century by Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple of St. John. *Habemus annumerare eos, qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt in Ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos.** The regular succession of bishops from their first appointment by the Apostles, attested by Irenæus, and other fathers of the church, is an irrefragable evidence of the truth of Christianity, as well as of the *αρχαιον της εκκλησιας συστημα*.

During Christ's ministry on earth the inspection and government of the church rested on our Lord himself. The great “bishop of our souls” was

* *Contra Hæres. Lib. 3. c. 3.*

and is the only *universal bishop* of his church; a title which no human being can arrogate without impiety. Before the ascension of Christ he committed this inspection and government to the apostles. On them devolved, at first, jointly the care of all the churches, which were planted in different parts of the world, except the church of Jerusalem, the mother of all Christian churches, which was committed to the special charge of St. James. As the number of churches increased they appointed others to the *ἐπισκοπή* or charge of particular churches. *Successiones Episcoporum*, says Irenæus, quibus illi (Apostoli) eam, quæ in unoquoque loco est, ecclesiam tradiderunt, quæ pervenit usque ad nos.* So in another passage the same father : omnes ii (hæretici) posteriores sunt quam episcopi, quibus apostoli tradiderunt Ecclesias.† Augustin says that the Christian church was extended through the world by means of the apostolical churches and the regular succession of their bishops : Radix societatis christianæ per sedes apostolorum et successiones episcoporum certa per orbem propagatione diffunditur.‡

To this succession of the bishops in the apostolical churches, the ancient fathers of the church appealed against the innovators of their days, as in the passage before quoted from Irenæus. Thus also Tertullian : Edant (hæretici) origines ecclesiarum suarum : evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, id est per successiones [ab initio] decurrentem, ut prim

* Contra Hæres. L. 4. c. 63.

† L. 5. c. 20.

‡ In Psalm. 44.

ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis, vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. Hoc enim modo ecclesiæ apostolicæ census suos deferunt.* On these passages of Irenæus and Tertullian, Pearson and Bingham have observed as follows: Erant quidem successiones episcoporum in apostolicis ecclesiis a veteribus observatæ, et ad catholicæ doctrinæ traditionem adversus hæreticorum deliria comprobendam usurpatæ; ex quibus argumentum a Patribus confectum est irrefragabile, cui hæretici nunquam respondere ausi sunt.† “This implies that the apostles, as they founded churches, settled bishops in them; and that this might be proved from the records and archives of every church, the most of which were probably then remaining, when Tertullian made this challenge to all heretics, and appealed to these original records in behalf of the catholic church.‡

In this manner Metaphrastes says the church of Britain was established: ἐπιμεινὼς τε ἐν Βρετανίᾳ, — καὶ ἐκκλησίας συστήσας, ἐπισκοποὺς τε καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους χειροτονήσας, &c. though he was mistaken in his account of the author of these appointments.

Considering, then, the authority of the *first witness* to St. Paul's western travels, and the means of authentic information; which the other fathers possessed, we may finally conclude, that the testimony respecting St. Paul's preaching in *the utmost bounds*

* De Præscript, c. 32.

† De Successione primorum Romæ Episcoporum, cap. III.

‡ Antiquities of the Christian church, B. II. ch. i. §. 3.

of the west, that is, in *Britain*, is indisputable, because

1. It is the testimony of St. Paul's fellow-labourer, who, of all men, best knew the extent of the apostle's travels ;

2. It is the testimony of a *Roman* bishop,

3. And is confirmed by the *eastern* fathers of the church, who must have known, if St. Paul's labours, after his release from his imprisonment at Rome, had been confined to *Italy* and the *East* ;

4. It is not the " fond conceit " of British writers, who might be desirous of doing honour to their country ;

5. But it is greatly confirmed by coincident events in Britain and Rome, recorded by British writers.

II.—ON THE TESTIMONY OF GILDAS.

The involved language of Gildas has led to much misapprehension of his meaning in the passage, which defines the time of the first introduction of the Gospel into Britain ; as in the following account of the passage. " After the black frost of a very
 " severe winter, Christ, the sun of righteousness,
 " warmed our country with the rays of his heavenly
 " doctrine, although the Senate or Parliament of
 " Rome resisted and endeavoured to stop the pro-
 " gress of the Gospel.—This is the meaning of the
 " whole that Gildas says, who wrote his history
 " about the year of Christ 546. It is evident there-
 " fore that the Gospel was first preached to this

“ island, as soon as the year of our Lord 62, or,
“ at furthest, the year 63.”

Gildas does not say that the Gospel was introduced into *this country* in the time of Tiberius, when the Senate opposed the Emperor's will concerning Christ; but that, at that time, its bright beams were displayed, *generally*, to the *whole world*; and afterwards, before the defeat of Boadicea, to *this island*. The two diffusions of the light of the Gospel are thus distinguished :

1. Universo orbi.
2. Insulæ rigenti, &c.

And these belong to two different periods of time :

1. Summo tempore Tiberij.
2. Interea primum, &c.

The *general* diffusion of the Gospel was in the latter part of Tiberius's reign; the introduction of it into *this country*, was in the *interim* of the events mentioned by Gildas. This *interim* is limited on one hand, by the event, which is last mentioned by him, *viz.* the defeat of Boadicea, A.D. 61, and the other by events not far distant, such as the defeat of Caractacus, A.D. 51. This *interval* comprehends not more than ten years. The commencement of the interval is twelve years after the end of Tiberius's reign; the interim of it includes the time of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, (A. D. 57, 58) and the release of Caractacus's family, as well as of St. Paul, A.D. 58. It does not therefore follow from the testimony of Gildas, that the Gospel was first preached in Britain, “ as soon as the year

of our Lord 62, or, at furthest, the year 68," but before the year 61.

For the following observations on Claudia Rufina, Pomponia Græcina, and other Converts at Rome, I am indebted to Wm. Williams, Esq. of Ivy Tower, the learned author of *Primitive History, the Christian Code, a New Translation of the New Testament, &c.*

III.—ON THE BRITISH CONVERTS, CLAUDIA RUFINA AND POMPONIA GRÆCINA.

I have been all along of opinion that St. Paul's *Claudia* came from Britain in the reign of Claudius, and not later than the public entry of Aulus Plautius; whose wife, Pomponia Græcina, became attached to the foreign superstition, such as Christianity was deemed. I beg leave to set down and remark on the words of Tacitus, *Annal.* 13. 32, premising that his last words are somewhat mysterious; and that the serious and reserved manners of this Christian Convert, our Pagan writer stigmatizes, as *cultus lugubris et animus mæstus*; a sorrowful deportment, and sad turn of mind. He imputes this temper to a long unabating concern about the murder of Julia, daughter of Drusus, through Messalina. Perhaps she was willing that her gloomy habit should be attributed to that cruel deed, rather than to solemn reflection on the abandoned lives of the Pagan world; which motive would

be heinously offensive to the votaries of Venus, and the sports of the Lupercalia. She had been arraigned on account of her conversion, and might not another time have been favourably treated. I cannot say I clearly comprehend the last words in the passage below from Tacitus, and what “*Glory*” he means!

“ Pomponia Græcina, insignis fœmina, Plautio, qui Ovans se de Britanniis retulit, nupta; ac superstitionis externæ rea, mariti judicio permissa, isque prisco instituto, propinquis coram, de capite fama-que conjugis cognovit, et insontem nunciavit.—Longa huic Pomponiæ ætas, et continua tristitia fuit.—Nam post Juliam Drusi filiam dolo Messalinæ interfectam, per 40 annos, non cultu nisi lugubri, non animo nisi mœsto, egit. Idque illi, imperitante Claudio, impune; mox ad *gloriam* vertit.”

“ Pomponia Græcina, a celebrated lady (married to Plautius, who returned with public honours from the Britannias) being accused of the foreign superstition, was referred to her husband’s decision. So he, by an ancient institute, took cognizance, in the presence of (their) neighbours, of his wife’s reputation, and capital hazard; and pronounced her not guilty.—This Pomponia’s life was long; and (her) sadness permanent. For, after Julia, daughter of Drusus (was) murdered by Messalina’s contrivance, she went through 40 years, not otherwise than in a sorrowful manner, not otherwise than with a troubled mind. And this during the reign of Claudius,

with impunity ; soon afterwards redounded to *Glory.*"

I am persuaded that this great lady (converted to Christianity) convinced not only many of the British dames, who graced her husband's Ovation, but Roman ladies also ; and Plautius, on his wife's trial, was probably ready to say, as Agrippa to Paul, " Thou almost persuadest me to be a Christian."

Before Paul left Corinth the last time, we find that many converts were at Rome (well known THEN to Paul) where AQUILLA and PRISCILLA can never be suspected of having been idle. Banished as they were, they returned thither very speedily, Rom. xvi. 3. compared with Acts xviii. And Paul's good friend Phebe, a Deaconess of Cenchrea, was then at Rome, a most active and serviceable person, who, probably, bore Paul's Epistle to Rome ; in which he names several *zealous* Christians *there*, of his acquaintance there at least THREE YEARS before he attained Rome himself. Paul in his Epistle to Rome, besides extolling Phebe, Aquilla and Priscilla, as active in the good cause, praises a Mary, Andronicus, and Junia, Urban, Apelles, the family of Narcissus, Tryphena, Tryphosa ; Persis ; also RUFUS elected by the Lord ! Cannot this be Rufus Pudens, Claudia Rufina's husband ? Paul also calls the mother of Rufus, his own mother, so much she *fostered* Christianity ! All this was before Paul went last to Asia, and thence last to Jerusalem, where he was kept a prisoner above two years !

Owing to the above champions for Christ, so early and active at Rome, I would wonder not, a thousand Claudias were converted before Nero's fifth year!

IV.—PROTEST OF THE BRITISH CHURCH AGAINST THE CORRUPTIONS OF POPERY AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY. (Letter, p. 349, 350, Note).

The Old Chronicle, mentioned by Bishop Davies in his Letter to Archbishop Parker, is quoted also in his Preface to the Welsh Translation of the New Testament, printed in 1567. 'The Bishop's Preface was reprinted (Anthony Wood says) "among other things, and published by Charles Edwards, a Welshman, Oxf. 1671, in oct." It is quoted, with reference to the old Chronicle, by Theophilus Evans, Vicar of Llangamarch, in his *Drych y Prif Oesoedd* (1740.)

V.—H. N. T. S.'S OBJECTIONS TO THE PREACHING OF ST. PAUL IN BRITAIN.

A more violent perversion of authorities, or (if, in candour, it should be said) misconception of their meanings, is seldom to be met with, than what occurs in the objections made to the principal subject of the preceding Letter, by a correspondent of the *Christian Observer*, (who signs himself H. N. T. S.)

in what he has written *on the preaching of St. Paul in Britain*, No. 112, 113, for April and May, 1811.

He quotes the words of only two of the Fathers, Clemens-Romanus and Athanasius, and has mis-translated them both.

P. 208. He translates Clement's *ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς δυσέως*, "to the *borders* of the West," instead of the extremity, or *utmost bounds*, of the West, or "*ad occidentis terminos sive fines*," as Pearson translates the passage, and all other learned men, that I have met with, except Lardner, whom H. N. T. S. follows. But Lardner, though a very valuable collector of antiquities, was not learned in languages. Lardner says: "I rather think that Clement only meant Italy or Rome, where Clement was, and where Paul suffered. From a note of Le Clerc upon the place, we learn that Bishop Fell so understood Clement." He should have added, from the same note, the contrary authorities of Bishops Pearson and Stillingfleet, who did *not* so understand Clement, the former interpreting *τὸ τέλος τῆς δυσέως*, *Spain*, and the latter, *Britain*. Pearson says, *Quis unquam dixit Romanum fuisse terminos sive fines occidentis?*

P. 274. H. N. T. S. says "if it can be proved, that St. Paul did not visit Spain, it will be admitted to be even much less probable, that he ever entered England [Britain.]" And how does he prove it? He says, that St. Athanasius who is brought forward to prove that St. Paul preached in Spain, *only* says, that the Apostle was *ready* to go thither, *μη οὐκ εἶ.*"

It is almost incredible that any one should venture to appeal to a passage so contrary to his assertion, as the original, in this case is. The words of Athanasius are: (vol. i. p. 737, ed. Commelin) Μεχρι του Ιλλυρικου κηρυττει· και μη οκνει μη δε εις την Ρωμην απελθειν, μη δε εις τας Σπανιας αναβηναι, ινα οσον κοπιαι τοσουτον και του κοπου τον μισθον μειζονα απολαβη, *he preached as far as Illyricum; and did not hesitate even to return to Rome, and even to go to Spain, that, in proportion to the labour, he might receive the greater reward.* If the whole passage had been quoted, the contradiction would have been too glaring to commit to paper: for if St. Paul was *only ready* to go to Spain, he was only ready to return to Rome; and if the passage were a proof that he did not go to Spain, it would prove also, that he did not return to Rome. Μη οκνει is *did not hesitate*, did not decline, did not fear to go. Μη οκνει μη δε—μη δε is strongly expressive of St. Paul's zeal and labour and courage in undertaking these journies.

P. 273. He says, "It is very probable that St. Paul was never in Spain. Pope Gelasius especially denies it!!" This may be infallible authority with some of H. N. T. S.'s readers, but I am sure will not be with the majority; when it is opposed to the direct assertions of Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, among the ancients; and of Pearson among the moderns. Chrysostom says, Και αυδε ενταυθα ισταται, αλλα και εκειθεν εις Ισπανιαν εδραμεν, (Orat. 7, in S. Paulum, tom. viii. p. 59) Theodoret εκειθεν δε εις Σπανιας απελθων, και το θισον ηρεκεινους πρεσ-

συνεγκων Ευαγγελιον επανελθει. (In Philipp. I. 25.)

Pearson, following these authorities, says: Adveniente Timotheo, ex Italia profectus est in Hispaniam: quo iturum se dixerat in Epistola ad Romanos. (*Annales Paulini*, p. 20.)

P. 274. He says, "Grotius, in his zeal to prove that it was agreeable to the wisdom of Providence to give the widest circulation to the best of doctrines, includes (besides England) *America*, and the inmost recesses of the North, in his catalogue of the countries which received the Gospel, either by the means, or, at least, in the days of the Apostles. As there can be little doubt that neither America nor Ireland [Iceland] were known to the ancients, we may venture to exclude them at once; and perhaps we shall be inclined to consider as equally fabulous and heroic, &c."—Without consulting the original it might be at once affirmed, that Grotius can never have included *America* among the countries, which "received the Gospel, either by the means, or in the days of the Apostles." But here are his words: Conveniebat divinæ providentiæ id efficere, ut, quod optimum esset, pateret quam latissime. Id autem contigit Religioni Christianæ, quam ipse videmus per Europam omnem, ne Septentrionis quidem recessibus exclusis, *doceri*; nec minus per Asiam omnem, etiam ejus insulas in Oceano, per Ægyptum quoque, per Æthiopiam, et alias aliquot Africæ partes, postremo et per *Americam*. Neque id nunc tantum fieri, [Christianam religionem latissime patere,] sed et olim factum, [latissime patuisse] osten-

dunt omnium temporum historiæ, &c. (De Veritate, Relig. Chr. l. ii.) Grotius mentions America as a proof of the *present* extent of Christianity; and includes the Britons among the Christians of the *second century*, when Tertullian lived.

P. 209, he says, “ Fox, in his *hatred of Popery*, is very unwilling to allow Lucius the honour of introducing Christianity into England by means of Pope Eleutherius.” If Fox had any hatred of Popery, it is evident that H. N. T. S. has not. But it is not very candid to suppose, that Fox was governed in his opinion by his hatred of Popery rather than by the love of truth. For my own part, I do not believe that Christianity was introduced into Britain by means of Pope Eleutherius. I hope I have shewn in the preceding Letter, that it was introduced here more than a century before his time, and without the aid of any Pope. But I am lead to think this, not from any hatred of Popery, but from a perfect conviction that St. Paul preached the Gospel in Britain, and that the church of Britain was fully established before the church of Rome.

**A SECOND LETTER FROM THE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S
TO THE CLERGY OF HIS DIOCESE;**

ON

**THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE ANCIENT
BRITISH CHURCH ON ANY FOREIGN
JURISDICTION:**

WITH A

POSTSCRIPT ON THE TESTIMONY OF CLEMENS ROMANUS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

BRITISH subjects entitle themselves to all the privileges of the British Constitution by conformity to the laws of their country. By these laws it is declared, that the King is the supreme temporal head of the church in this United Kingdom; and that no foreign Sovereign, Prelate, or Potentate, ought to have any jurisdiction, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm. Conforming subjects bind themselves by an oath to this purpose. Our Roman Catholick brethren decline such conformity; they decline it on account of conscience; and yet they claim a right to the highest privileges of conforming subjects. If it can be proved, that their scruples of conscience, respecting the Pope's Supremacy,* have

* See an account of other scruples at the end of the Postscript, page 389.

no foundation in scripture,—or in the primitive history of the church,—or in reason, this should induce such recusants to conform to the laws of their country; but if we cannot convince *them*, that their scruples are unfounded, *Protestants, who know them to be unfounded*, can have no doubt, that groundless scruples are not a sufficient reason for dispensing with the constitution of our country.

Reverend Brethren,

THE discourse, to which my letter, lately addressed to you, is an introduction, has for its principal object to illustrate one branch of the external evidences of Christianity, namely, *the Apostolical origin of the British Church*, and its seven Epochs from the first introduction of the Gospel into Britain, to the rejection of Popery by the British Bishops at the commencement of the seventh century. These Epochs are

Cent. 1. St. Paul's preaching of the Gospel in Britain.

Cent. 2. Lucius's publick protection of Christianity.

Cent. 3.—4. The Diocletian persecution.

Cent. 4. The Councils of Arles, Sardica, and Ariminium.

Cent. 5. The suppression of Pelagianism.

Cent. 6. The Synod of Llanddewi Brefi.

Cent. 7. The rejection of Popery by the British Bishops.

In these seven Epochs we have very ample and substantial evidence of Christianity,—a Christian church in Britain founded by St. Paul, and subsisting for near six centuries before the arrival of Austin, the Monk,—and in that subsistence a proof of its entire independence on any foreign jurisdiction.

Foreign jurisdiction is so obviously inconsistent with the independence of any nation, that nothing can be more surprising, than that any considerable portion of the subjects of a civilized and free country should adhere to such authority; nothing more reasonable, than that effective barriers should be provided against its dangerous influence. For though (thanks to a kind Providence, and to the barriers provided by our Protestant constitution) that influence is at present dormant in this country, as to any civil consequences; yet we cannot forget what it was for the four centuries preceding the Reformation; and we cannot but know, that the church of Rome has renounced none of those principles, which were the causes of our separation.

The Roman Catholics of this Empire, who conscientiously acknowledge the Pope's *supremacy*, and believe, that he and his church are *infallible*, have, probably, in that conscientious profession and belief a bias more than equal to any arguments that Protestants can bring against it. But if we cannot persuade them to renounce this unnational and anti-british jurisdiction, we are at least bound to strengthen our own consciences, and to maintain our own duty, by holding up to *their* view, as well as to our *fellow-*

Protestants, this invincible truth, that the Pope's supremacy has no foundation in Scripture, nor in the primitive history of the church. That it has not, I have endeavoured to prove in my former letter, by shewing, from the *natural construction of the context*, that our Saviour, in his discourse to the Apostles, did not promise to build his church on St. Peter; and from the *first establishment of the Church*, that it was not so founded; but on his confession, **THE MESSIAHSHIP OF JESUS**.

To what I have there said, I take this opportunity of adding a few words, in answer to a challenge which Popish writers have been accustomed to hold out on this subject:—"We defy them to shew any passage of any Father, that excludes St. Peter." Every passage in the comments of the Fathers which confines our Saviour's promise to the *confession* of St. Peter, does, in effect, exclude the *person* of St. Peter. Such as the following passages of Chrysostom:—"On this rock, that is, on the faith, which St. Peter had confessed." (In Matth. xvi. 18.) "Christ said that he would build his church on the confession of St. Peter:—" (In Joh. i. 50.) Many other passages of the Fathers to the same purpose may be seen in Juell, Barrow, Leslie, Leslie's Vindicator, &c. which as clearly exclude St. Peter, as if they had said, *not on St. Peter*, but on his confession. Cyrill, however, expresses himself more strongly:—"Christ "gave the name of the rock to *nothing* else, but to the unshaken and most constant faith of his disciple." (De S. Trin. Dial. 4.) But Chrysostom

tom, or some ancient writer in his name, says expressly, but not more significantly :—" Upon rock ; he said *not upon Peter* ; for he did not his church on the man, but on his faith." Chr. Tom. 5. Or. 163.)

The judgment, therefore, of the Fathers is adduced to the supremacy of the Pope by confining the promise of our Saviour to the *confession* of St. Peter and excluding the *person* of the Apostle. And the history of the primitive church is not more favourable to it. Indeed down as low as the end of the fifth century the title of *universal Bishop* was considered by Gregory the Great, not merely as unscriptural but as " vain, impious, execrable, blasphemous, antichristian."* It was however given to a successor of Gregory in the next century by the centurion Emperor Justinian. But the nefarious instrument, by whom it was bestowed, could not confer on it validity or authority. " The imperial edict, if we may so call the edict of an usurper, and a tyrant, was not, as the papal writers pretend, a bare *confirmation* of the prior title, but the grant of a *new title*, which the Pope immediately improved into a power, answering to the power of the *universal Bishop*. And thus was the power of the Pope, as *universal Bishop*, or head of the church, or, in other words, the Papal Supremacy, first introduced."†

* Bower's Hist. of the Popes, Vol. II. p. 507. For his excellent *Instructiones Historico-Theologicæ*, Lib. : vii. §. 16. 21. says :—*Nomen universalis abjudicat Gregorius, lestum, antichristianum, diabolicum, et hereticum ; in isto scelesto vocabulo consentire, nihil est aliud, quam fidem per-*

† Bower's History of the Popes, Vol. II. p. 548. See also Hammond's Works, Vol. II. p. 256.

As to the history, then, of the Pope's supremacy, as universal Bishop, it was unknown in fact, and condemned in principle, down to the end of the sixth century. But if the sense of scripture, the judgment of the Fathers, and the evidence of history have no weight against the authority of the Romish Church; we may ask further, if, in this country at least, the Pope's supremacy is defensible on any rational grounds? Is it not contrary to every constitutional principle of a free and independent government? Let us hear, what the great master of the revolutionary drama, now acting in Europe, has said on the subject. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.* In his address to the Legislative Body at Paris (Nov. 1809), he says: "The Popes, become sovereigns of part of Italy, have constantly shewn themselves enemies of every preponderating power on the Peninsula. They have employed their spiritual power to injure it.—It was then demonstrated to me, that the spiritual influence exercised in my states by a *foreign Sovereign*, was contrary to the independence of France, to the dignity and safety of my throne." In his address to the Legislative Body in June, 1811, he says: "The union of Rome is the only means, whereby that proper influence, which the Pope ought to possess over spiritual concerns, can be rendered compatible with the principles of the empire, which cannot suffer any *foreign Bishop* to exercise an authority therein."

We have seen before from how unjust and corrupt a source the title of universal Bishop originated.

But if the Roman Emperors had possessed ever so legitimate a right to establish one supreme head over the whole *Roman* church ; they had no power to extend such authority beyond the limits of the Empire ; and the Bishop of Rome, the constituted head of the imperial church, had still less right to assume it. Britain had long ceased to be a part of the Roman empire, when Gregory, the very Pope who so forcibly reprobated the title of universal Bishop, sent Austin here for the conversion of the Saxons, and for the establishment of a new spiritual jurisdiction. The Britons, as might have been expected, disclaimed all subjection to his authority.

But some Romish writers pretend that the Bishop of Rome has a right to obedience from this country, on account of Austin's having planted Christianity here in his mission from the Pope. That Christianity was not first introduced into Britain by Austin, the seven bishops, whom he found here, and the metropolitan whom they acknowledged, are a sufficient proof. And, that Christianity was never extinct, but had existed here from its first introduction by St. Paul, every century that preceded the arrival of Austin, has its own historical evidence. In the *sixth* century we have the synod of Llanddewi Brefi ; in the *fifth*, the suppression of the Pelagian heresy ; in the *fourth*, the presence of British bishops at the councils of Arles, Sardica, and Ariminum, and, probably, Nice ; in the *third* and *fourth*, the Diocletian persecution ; in the *second*, Lucius's publick protection of Christianity ; in the *first*, the preach-

ing of St. Paul, and, perhaps, of other apostles, or apostolical men.*

Among the valuable evidences of the British church in the *fourth* century, we have two testimonies of Jerome to the *independence* of the British church, and its *sufficiency for salvation*. Of the latter he says: "The way is open to Heaven from Britain as well as from Jerusalem:" Et de Hierosolymis et de Britannia æqualiter patet aula cœlestis. (Epist. 13. ad Paulinum, Op. Vol. I. p. 103.) Of the *independence* of the churches of Gaul, Britain, Africa, &c. as parts of one universal church, he says: "Nec altera Romanæ Urbis ecclesia, altera totius orbis existimanda est. Et Galliæ, et Britannia, et Africa, et Persis, et Oriens, et India, et omnes barbaræ nationes unum Christum adorant, unam observant regulam veritatis. Si *authoritas* quæritur, *Orbis major est Urbe*. Ubicunque fuerit Episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandria, sive Tanis; *eiusdem meriti est, ejusdem et sacerdotii*." (Epist. ad Euagrium, Op. Vol. I. p. 334.)

The author of the antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon church says: "After a long and doubtful struggle, the religion, with the government of the natives, took beneath the persevering efforts of the Saxons."†

* Philip and Aristobulus. The traditions concerning Peter, James, Simon Zelotes, and Joseph of Arimathea, are either destitute of evidence, or are full of difficulties and contradictions, which cannot be said of the western travels of St. Paul; nor, I think, of Aristobolus, nor, perhaps, of Philip.

Vol. I. p. 7.

Christianity was indeed banished from the interior provinces of the Britons, by their pagan invaders, but was not extirpated from Britain. The suppression of the Pelagian heresy in the fifth century had infused new vigour into every part of the British church. Schools, monasteries, churches, were established; and were directed by men of great learning and piety;* and the fruits of their labours were in a flourishing state, when Austin, the Pope's missionary, found here an ancient and independent church,† which resisted all his proposals of submission to his authority. The Abbot of Bangor's answer refused subjection to Austin and to the Pope. Popish writers indeed object to the genuineness of the MS. from which Sir H. Spelman published the Abbot's answer, which has been learnedly defended by Hammond, Stillingfleet, and Bingham; and admitted by Carte.‡ But if their vindication and authority be not sufficient, we have the substance of the fact abundantly confirmed by other evidence of the sentiments of the British church.

As the Abbot of Bangor's answer to Austin is an interesting part of this inquiry; and as, in the investigation of the subject an appeal is made to the propriety of some Welsh terms in the Welsh copy of that

* Carte's Hist. of England, Vol. I. p. 186, and Roberts's Collectanea Cambrica, Vol. I. Appendix VI. p. 308, 309.

† Hujus Archiepiscopatus memoriam libentius colo, quod ante adventum Augustini *eximia polleret antiquitate*, nullamque vel ab eo vel ejus successoribus ordinationem acceperit subjectionemve iisdem præstiterit, usque ad tempus Henrici I. (SPELMANNI Concilia, p. 27.)

‡ Carte's Hist. Vol. I. p. 224.

answer; I have subjoined to this letter Hammond's learned account of some objections which were formerly made to the copy published by Sir H. Spelman.

Popish writers ask: "Are we to conclude from the rejection of the authority of Austin, that the Britons also disavowed the supremacy of the Pontiff?"* Certainly: their church had been governed by its own Bishops for near six hundred years, that is, from the first introduction of the Gospel, independantly of any foreign authority. The British bishops acknowledged no spiritual jurisdiction, but that of their own metropolitan. But Gregory had, it seems, "invested Austin with an extensive jurisdiction over all the bishops of the Britons;" and Austin had now been long enough in the Island† for him and his commission to be well known even to the inhabitants of the West. The British bishops, therefore in rejecting the authority of Austin, disavowed the supremacy and jurisdiction of the Pope, who sent him. What does the Scripture say of the first Christian commission? "He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him, that sent me." However great the difference in the two commissions, the conclusion is the same, from the rejection of the person sent, to the disavowal of his authority, who sent him.

"Treading in the footsteps of his predecessor Celestine, who two centuries before had appointed

* Linguard's Anglo-Saxon Church, Vol. I. p. 64.

† He landed in the isle of Thanet, A. D. 597. The conference between him and the British Bishops was in the year 603.

the Monk Palladius to the government of the *Scottish* church, he invested Augustine with an extensive jurisdiction over *all* the bishops of the Britons.* From this passage the unwary reader may be led to suppose that the Popes exercised spiritual jurisdiction in *Britain* before the arrival of Austin; and that having interposed in the government of the *North British* church, they now *only extended* their jurisdiction over *all the rest* of the British bishops. But this was not the case. The Scoti, or Scotti, had not settled in Britain till near a century after the time of Celestine. Ireland was the *patria Scotorum*, as is affirmed by Orotius, Isidore, Bede, &c. And to Ireland Palladius was undoubtedly sent, not to North Britain, as will be evident from a few of the passages collected by Usher on the subject.† Though from the passages below quoted it appears that Palladius was sent by the *Pope* to Ireland, yet this

* Linguard's Anglo-Saxon Church, Vol. I. p. 64.

† Eccles. Britan. Antiq. p. 320. 797—816. Prosper says: "Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatur a Papa Celestino Palladius, et *primus* Episcopus mittitur. Possevinus calls Palladius *primus Hiberniæ* episcopus. M. Florilegus says: *Missus est Palladius ad Scotos*: and then distinguishes Scotia from Britain: *Qui primo verbum Dei in Scotia prædicans, tandem Britanniam pervenit, et in terra Pictorum defunctus est.* Joscelin says: *Præmiserat Papa Celestinus prædicandi causa in Hiberniam Palladium.* An anonymous writer of the acts of Patricius says: *Celestinus ordinavit Palladium et ad Scotos convertendus ad Christum in Hiberniam misit.*—*Est autem Hibernia insula omnium insularum post Britanniam maxima. Hæc jam insula proprie Scotorum est patria.* The distinction between Scotia major (Ireland) and Scotia minor (Scotland) is illustrated by Usher, p. 797, 798.

mission does not seem to have established any dependence on the Pope or church of Rome ; for we learn from Bede, as will be seen presently, that, at the commencement of the seventh century, the Irish (Scoti) were as averse to the church of Rome, as the Britons were. When Ninian, who was educated at Rome, converted the Picts in Britain, and Palladius was sent to the Scots in Ireland, *popery* did not exist. The religion of Rome was then the religion of the church universal.

But “ the independence of their church was ” *not* “ the chief object of their solicitude.”* It is evident from the testimony of the old chronicle quoted by Bishop Davies in his letter to Archbishop Parker † that the Britons not only rejected the authority of Austin, but the doctrines and usages of his church. The chronicle says, that they would hold no communication with the Saxons, *when converted by Austin*, because “ they corrupted with superstition, images, and idolatry, the true religion of Christ.” This is surely a rejection not only of the authority of Austin, but of his church, and therefore of the Pope.

The account, which the chronicle gives of the sentiments of the British church is consonant with the testimony of Bede, respecting the conduct of the Irish as well as of the Britons. “ That primitive plainness and simplicity of worship was still retained, at the

Lingard's Anglo-Saxon Church, Vol. I. p. 67.

Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. David's, p. 46.

arrival of Austin by the Britons, by the Scots, [Irish] and the Picts, who were so shocked at the many pagan superstitions and ceremonies introduced by that monk into the Saxon worship, that they looked upon it as no better than paganism; and avoided, as Bede informs us, the communion of those, who came from Rome to establish it, as they avoided the communion of Pagans; nay, so great was the aversion, that the Scots [Irish] in particular bore to all the Roman missionaries, that Daganus, a bishop of that nation, not only declined sitting with them at the same table, but would not even lodge with them under the same roof.* The words of Bede are: *Quippe cum usque hodie moris sit Brittonum, fidem religionemque Anglorum pro nihilo habere, neque in aliquo eis magis communicare quam paganis. (L. II. c. 20.) Scottos vero per Daganum Episcopum in hanc, quam superius nominavimus, insulam, et Columbanum Abbatem in Gallos venientem, nihil discrepare a Brittonibus, in eorum conversatione didicimus. Nam Daganus Episcopus ad nos veniens non solum cibum nobiscum, sed nec in eodem hospitio, quo vescebamur, sumere voluit. (L. II. c. 4.)*

Bede gives this account on the authority of Laurentius, who was one of the missionaries that accompanied Austin, and was his immediate successor in the see of Canterbury; and better authority we need not seek for the entire independence of the British and Irish churches on the Church of Rome, and their alienation from it.

* Bower's Hist. of the Popes, Vol. II. p. 527.

Humphrey Lloyd, therefore, had good reason for saying of the period of which we are now speaking, that “ in those daies the Brytaines refused the doctrine of Augustine, as erroneous and corrupt ;” and that “ the Brytaines did abhorre the Romish doctrine taught in that time, which doctrine, (I am sure), is little amended now in the church of Rome ; and that may be a mirrour to us to see our owne follie, if we do degenerate from our fore-fathers the ancient Brytaines in the sinceritie of true religion.”*

In the fourth century, as we have before seen, the church of Britain was one of many equal and independent parts of the universal church. The church of Rome was then content with her priority in rank, (as the church of the imperial city), and in learning. An ancient and frequent intercourse had subsisted between the churches of Rome and Britain, as long as Britain was a part of the Roman empire, and for some years afterwards. For the churches of Rome and of Britain were then the same in doctrine at least, if not in discipline. But two centuries made a great difference in the progress of error and innovation. And the church of Britain, which in the *fourth* century was an independent church, was also, at the commencement of the *seventh*, a truly Protestant church, protesting against the corruptions of superstition, images, and idolatry, and refusing all communion with the church of Rome.

Oh ! for the warning voice of the Apocalypse to

* *Historie of Cambria*, p. 184, 185, ed. 1911.

impress the sentiments of the ancient British and Irish Churches on the minds of their posterity, who are now members of that Church, which their ancestors so strongly condemned; that they might view all submission to a foreign jurisdiction in the same light, which their ancestors did; and, extricating themselves from the magick bonds of *Popish supremacy* and *infallibility*, might emancipate their minds from all impediments to the knowledge of the truth, and return to their ancient simplicity and independance. “Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou has not kept thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do thy first works; or else I will come to thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent.”†

I am, Reverend Brethren,

Your faithful and affectionate

Friend and Brother,

T. ST. DAVID'S.

Abergwilly Palace,

Nov. 4th, 1812.

† Revelations, ii. 4, 5.

POSTSCRIPT

“ Having taught righteousness to the whole world, and having travelled to the *utmost bounds of the West*, and having suffered martyrdom under the Roman Præfects, he departed this life, and went to the holy place, an illustrious example of patient suffering.”

CLEMENS ROMANUS.

EVERY passage of antiquity, which brings Britain within the *utmost bounds of the West*, and illustrates the facilities of communication between Britain, Spain, and Rome, is of importance in the inquiry respecting St. Paul's journey to Britain, inasmuch as it removes from the testimony of Clemens Romanus all appearance of rhetorical or extravagant expression. I wish therefore to recall your attention to this part of the evidence of St. Paul's western travels, for the sake of adding to the testimonies given in my former Letter.

St. Paul in his epistle to the Romans promises to go to Spain. His fellow-labourer, Clemens Romanus, affirms that St. Paul, in preaching the Gospel, went to the *utmost bounds of the West*, which included Spain and Britain. The journey from Rome to Britain was not at all an impracticable one; and Clement was a perfectly competent judge of the extent of St. Paul's travels. What then should render the literal sense of Clement's testimony inadmissible? Is it a solitary testimony? or is it extravagant and hyperbolical in its language?

If it were a solitary testimony, and we had nothing in the rest of the Fathers to explain its meaning, or to countenance the supposition that by the *utmost bounds of the West* were meant Spain and Britain, we might be content with the single satisfaction that there is nothing in the Fathers which is contradictory to such supposition, or to the literal meaning of the passage, and something in St. Paul's expressed intention, which renders it probable. But it is not a solitary testimony; and there is, besides, other direct evidence in the Fathers both to explain its meaning, and to confirm the fact declared by its literal sense. There are many passages in the Fathers, which assure us, that the Gospel was preached in Britain *in the days of the Apostles*,—that Britain was visited by *some of the Apostles*,—and more than one, that *St. Paul* in particular was there. Let me remind you of one or two passages before quoted, the first of which I select because it most resembles the language of Clement, and at the same time illustrates his meaning. It is the passage, that comes nearest in antiquity to the testimony of Clement, and is from a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of St. John. Irenæus says, that the Gospel was preached by the Apostles, and their disciples to the *utmost bounds of the earth*, ἕως πέρατων τῆς γῆς. Spain and the British Isles were then the utmost bounds of the known world, to the West. The utmost bounds of the earth, πέρατα τῆς γῆς, in the language of antiquity, meant particularly the West. Hesychius interprets Homer's πέρατα γαίης by τὴν δυσιν.* But Irenæus ex-

* See Barker's *Classical Recreations*, p. 344–348.

emplifies his meaning by mentioning the Churches that were established in Germany, Spain and the Celtic nations, of which Britain was one. Tertullian, who was contemporary with Irenæus, repeats the same testimony to the extensive propagation of the Gospel, but more particularly, by expressly mentioning Britain:—*Hispaniarum omnes termini, et Galliarum diversæ nationes, et Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita.* Eusebius and Theodoret say, that Britain was visited by some of the Apostles; Theodoret again, and Jerome, by St. Paul.

We cannot therefore doubt what Clement meant by the *utmost bounds of the West*. He could not have been deceived; and the other Fathers had authentic means of information beside the testimony of Clement. What then is the amount of the information, which we have, respecting St. Paul's *western travels*? St. Paul promises to make a journey to Spain. His fellow-labourer says that in preaching the Gospel he went to the utmost bounds of the West, which included Spain and Britain; and this is confirmed by evidence from the most ancient Fathers, some of whom affirm, that the British Isles were visited by some of the Apostles, and particularly, by St. Paul.

There is an interesting passage in Gregory's *Morals*, on the Church of Britain, which may serve to illustrate the meaning of Clemens, by shewing the connection of Britain with the *extremity of the West*, and the *utmost bounds of the World*. *Omnipotens Dominus coruscantibus rubibus cardines maris operuit, quia emicantibus prædicatorum miraculis ad fidem etiam*

terminos mundi perduxit. Ecce enim pene cunctarum jam gentium corda penetravit, ecce in una fide Orientis *limitemque Occidentis* conjunxit; ecce lingua Britanniae, quæ nil aliud noverat quam barbarum fundere, *jamdudum* in divinis laudibus *Hebræum* cœpit Halleluja resonare.* We have here a very learned Pope's testimony to the Christianity of Britain in the sixth century, and to a considerable advancement in religious knowledge, *Hebræum* Hallelujah resonare: which (*jamdudum* resonare) seems hardly applicable to the new Saxon converts. It was probably written on Austin's first report of an ancient existing Church, and before the rejection of his authority. The knowledge of Hebrew was probably brought to Britain by the pilgrims, who resorted to Jerusalem during the three centuries preceding Austin's arrival.

The connection between Spain, Gaul, and the British Isles is noticed by Tacitus not unaptly for our purpose, as it shews the facility of communication between the several countries in the first century, and of course increases the probability of St. Paul's journey to Spain and Britain. Hibernia medio inter Britanniam atque Hispaniam sita, et Gallico quoque mari opportuna, valentissimam imperii partem magnis invicem usibus miscuerit—Solum cœlumque et ingenia cultusque hominum haud multum a Britannia differunt. Melius aditus portusque per commercia et negotiatores cogniti.†

* Gregorii Mag. XXVII. *Moralium*, c. 6.

† *Agricolæ Vita*.

As a proof that Jerome included Britain within the *utmost bounds of the West*, I referred in my former letter to a passage quoted in Gibson's translation of Camden's *Britannia*. The passage is not in the *Epitaphium Marcellæ*, as there cited, but in the letter *ad Marcellam*, which was written to invite Marcella to Bethlehem*. *Quicumque in Gallia fuerit primus, huc properat. Divisus ab orbe nostro Britannus, si in religione profecerit,† occiduo sole dimisso, quærit locum fama sibi tantum et scripturarum relatione cognitum. Quid referamus Armenios, quid Persas, &c.‡*

Theodoret speaking of the multitudes that flocked to Syria, attracted by the austerities of Symeon, the Stylite, says, that "many persons came from the *remotest parts of the West*, from Spain and Britain, and from Gaul, which lies between them:" ἀφικοντο δε πολλοι, τας της ἐσπερας οικοντες εσχατιας, Σπανιοι τε και Βρετανοι, και Γαλαται, οἱ το μεσον τουτων κατεχοντες§. We cannot have a more literal interpretation of Clement's το τερμα της δυσεως, than Theodoret's τας της ἐσπερας εσχατιας, nor a plainer proof that in the *utmost bounds of the West* Clement included Britain, the remotest of the three countries.

* Hieron. Op. Vol. I. p. 128. ed. Lugd. 1530.

† These words, which in the English edition of Camden are, unslated, *if they go in pilgrimage*, are explained in Erasmus's *holia* by (si in religione) *provecior fuerit*.

‡ It is a great loss to young students in Theology and to the *ers* of devotional reading, that the Epistles and miscellaneous *ks* of Jerome are not more accessible to common readers,

§ Theodoret. *Historia Relig.* p. 881. Vol. III.

It appears then that the *West* and the *utmost bounds of the West*, being in Clement's time, equivalent to Spain and Britain, there can be nothing rhetorical or extravagant in his saying that St. Paul went to the utmost bounds of the West, as there was nothing impracticable in the distance from Rome to Britain. What was practicable to Austin in the sixth century, could not be difficult to St. Paul in the first. A pilgrimage from Britain to Jerusalem was much more difficult; yet that was very common in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. But, indeed, our learned objectors, who doubt the reality of St. Paul's journey to Britain, are willing to admit that he might have conveyed the glad tidings of salvation to this country by his disciples and converts. There is nothing there improbable in the literal sense of Clement's testimony, but what arises from the short space, which the objectors themselves allot to the interval between St Paul's release from imprisonment and his return to Rome. *One year*, it is said, is insufficient for the Apostle's western travels. It is not only insufficient, but it is contrary to the testimony of antiquity. Eusebius and Jerome, who say, that St. Paul who sent to Rome in the 2d year of Nero, A. D. 56, and of course was released in the year 58, say also, that he suffered martyrdom in the 14th year of Nero, (A. D. 68,)* a space quite sufficient for the Apostle's travels

* Jerome, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers, (which Erasmus calls *eruditum opus et Hieronymo dignum*,) says, *Post passionem Domini vicesimo quinto anno, id est, secundo Neronis, eo tempore, quo Festus Procurator Judæe successit Felici, Romanam*

in the West and East. This space has been greatly contracted by a theory, resting altogether on conjectures, which I have endeavoured in my former letter, to shew are unfounded, respecting the duration of Felix's government, at the expiration of which St. Paul was sent to Rome. Admit the interval asserted by Eusebius and Jerome, and there is nothing improbable in St. Paul's western travels. Admit the western travels, and there will be no want of materials to fill the interval of time attested by those learned Fathers. *

A ROMAN CATHOLIC'S REASONS WHY HE CANNOT CONFORM TO THE PROTESTANT RELIGION, EXAMINED AND ANSWERED.

Reasons.

1. BECAUSE the Protestant Religion is a new religion, which had no being in the world, till one thousand five hundred years after Christ; and therefore it comes 1500 years too late to be the true Church of Christ. Martin Luther laid the *first* foundation of the Protestant Religion in the year 1517.

Answers.

1. THE Religion of Protestants in this united Kingdom is not a new religion, but is as old as the days of St. Paul, who preached it and established it in Britain.

The Church of Britain was fully established before the Church of Rome.

Martin Luther did not lay the first foundation of the

vinctus mittitur.—Hic ergo quarto decimo Neronis anno, eodem die quo Petrus, Romæ pro Christo capite truncatus sepultusque est in via Ostiensi, anno post passionem Domini tricesimo septimo.

* Eusebius, Jerome, Nicephorus, Euthalius Diaconus, &c. say that St. Paul suffered in the 14th of Nero, A. D. 68: so also Simson, Pearson, and Stillingfleet.

Reasons.

2. Because the Protestant Religion cannot be true, except the whole Scripture, both of the old and new Testament, from the beginning to the end, be false, which in so many places assures us, that the Church of Christ shall never go astray. For every one knows that the Protestant Religion pretends to be a *Reformation* of the Church of Christ.

3. Because the *first* foundations of the Protestant Religion were laid by an insupportable pride in one man, *viz.* Luther.

4. Because Luther and the first Protestants, when they began to set up their new Religion, and disclaimed the au-

Answers.

Protestant Religion. The Church of Britain protested against the superstition and idolatry of the Church of Rome, and would hold no communion with it, as early as the beginning of the seventh Century.

2. The Protestant Religion does not pretend to be a reformation of the *Church of Christ*, but of the *Church of Rome*. The Scripture no where says, that the Church of Rome shall not go astray. The Church of Rome has undoubtedly greatly gone astray by idolatry in the invocation of Saints, and by the suppression of half of the Eucharist in refusing the cup to the Laity, &c. &c.

3. The religion of Protestants in this united kingdom, as was observed before, is coeval with St. Paul. But the first Protest against the Church of Rome was made by the British Bishops of the seventh Century.

4. Protestants believe in the *holy Catholic* Church by believing that the universal church of Christ is one holy Catholic

Reasons.

thority and doctrine of all churches then upon earth, could not say the Creed without *telling a lie*, when they came to that article, *I believe in the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints.*

5. Because the Protestant Church has not those marks by which the Nicene Creed directs us to the true Church of Christ: is not *one, holy, catholic, and apostolical*. 1. It is not *one*, because the different branches of the pretended Reformation are divided from one another in faith and communion, &c. 2. Their Church is not *holy*; neither in her doctrine, nor in the lives either of her first teachers, or of their followers. 3. Their Church is not *Catholic*; they are sensible this name belongs not to them, and therefore they have taken to themselves another name, *viz.* that of Protestants. And indeed how should their church be Catholic or Universal, which implies being in all ages, and in all nations; since

Answers.

Church. They believe in this holy Catholic Church, though they do not believe the Church of Rome to be the whole Church of Christ. They believe in the communion of Saints, though they do not ascribe to them the attribute of omnipresence by praying to them.

5. There is no Church called *the Protestant Church*. There are different branches of the Church of Christ protesting against the errors of the Church of Rome, such as the Lutheran Church, and the Church of England. The universal Church of Christ is *one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolical*; but the before-mentioned branches of this Church do not pretend to be the whole Church of Christ. Yet they are *one* with the universal Church, as the disciples of Christ are one with Christ; (2.) they are *holy*, as being parts of that which is holy; (3.) they are *Catholic*, as being parts of the Church universal; and (4.) they are *Apostolical*, because they are founded on the doctrines and discipline of

Reasons.

it had no being for fifteen ages, and is unknown in most nations. 4. Their Church is not *Apostolical*; since it neither was founded by any of the Apostles, nor has any succession of doctrine, communion, or lawful mission.

6. Because Luther the *first* preacher of the Protestant religion, &c.

7. Because the *first* steps towards introducing the Protestant Religion into England were made by K. Henry VIII.

8. Because Protestancy was settled upon its present bottom in this kingdom by act of Parliament in the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, &c. How then can it be called the *Church of England*, or any Church at all, seeing it was introduced and established only by the authority of *mere laymen*, in opposition to the *Church*?

Answers.

the Apostles. The Britain is eminently *catholic* having been first established by St. Paul.

Protestants are called being members of the universal. They do not to be *catholic*, because they *protest* against the the Church of Rome improperly the term may be used by Protestants even by some Protestants opposed to the term

6. Luther lived hundred years after the *test* of the British against the Church.

7. Answered in N

8. Protestantism *restored* and *re-established* in the reign of Q. Elizabeth the British Church against Popery more centuries before the

Popish writers have an imperfect notion of the Church of Christ. The Church does not consist merely of the laity and the Clergy, but of the whole body of be-

Reasons.

Answers.

Christ, who observe the ordinances of Christ and his Apostles.

The preceding Reasons originating in great historical errors concerning the first introduction of Christianity into this country, and the first æra of Protestantism, I thought the examination of them not foreign to the subject of my two Letters. There are in all *thirteen* of these reasons for the Roman Catholic's non-conformity to the Church of England. • If the reader should be inclined to examine them further, they are to be seen in a little Tract published by *Keating, Brown, and Co.* entitled "A Roman Catholic's Reasons for not conforming to the Protestant Religion."

AN ACCOUNT OF H. T.'S APPENDIX TO HIS MANUAL OF CONTROVERSIES, CONCERNING THE ABBOT OF BANGOR'S ANSWER TO AUGUSTINE.

By H. HAMMOND, D. D.*

1. Having concluded the foregoing reply to the Catholic gentleman, I received news of a *Manual of Controversies* in the press, wherein I was said to be particularly concerned; and having soon gotten a sight

* Hammond's Works, Vol. II. p. 55.—The Welsh and English copies of the Abbot's answer being mere translations of the original Latin, they are considered by Dr. Hammond no otherwise than as they are connected with H. T.'s objections.

of it, I found that the matter was of no greater bulk or weight, than might receive an account in few words, and those most proper to be here annexed, by way of Appendix.

2. At the folding up of that Manual, the author of it is pleased to take notice of (no more than) one testimony, which I had cited out of Sir Henry Spelman's *Anglicane Councils*, containing an answer of the abbot of Bangor to Augustine the monk, when he demanded of the Britains an acknowledgment of submission to the bishop of Rome.

3. The passage is to be seen at large, in Welsh, English, and Latin, in that Tome of the Councils, p. 108, and is recited in the treatise of Schism, p. 111,* and the sum of it is; that he and the rest of the British church were under the government of the archbishop of Cærlleon upon Usk, and owed no obedience (or respect, save that of fraternal charity) to the Pope of Rome.

4. This answer of that abbot, the author hath thought good to censure (by way of appendix to the article concerning the Pope's Supremacy) 1. As unapt to conclude against the Romanist's pretensions concerning the papal power over the whole church. 2. As unworthily alleged by persons of any ordinary judgment or erudition. 3. As that which may easily be convicted to be a simple imposture, and the ways of demonstrating it clearly, promised in that ensuing discourse.

* Hammond's Works, Vol. I. *Of Fundamentals, Schisme, and Herisie*, p. 354.

5. What those ways are, and how far short of the force or evidence of demonstration, I shall, with the reader's good leave, examine anon, after I have premised this one consideration, that the only thing, which is by us contested, and concluded against the Romanist from this testimony, is a matter of fact of known truth, and such as the Romanists themselves, (yea, and this author H. T. who hath thought fit to arraign this testimony) acknowledge to be such; and therefore, as in case this one testimony should be demonstrated to be a single imposture, we can very unconcernedly and easily part with it, standing in no manner of need of this auxiliary; so it is a little strange, that this author should think it worth his solemn pains, to wrest it out of our hands, and dedicate this whole appendix to that one work, when if he were successful to his wish, his acquisitions hereby, and proportionably our losses, must be so inconsiderable.

6. That which we conclude from hence against the Romanist, is no more but this, that the Britains, particularly those of Bangor, denied to yield obedience to the Pope, upon Augustine's demand of it. And for this, we have the notoriousness of the fact, as it is set down by the authors which are of credit, and are vouched in this matter by the Romanist, particularly by Bede, in the second book of his Ecclesiastical History, c. 2. where the whole story may be read at large, and out of which I shall collect, and, in passing, clear these few things.

7. First, that Augustine and the British bishops met in council at Augustine's Oak, in Worcestershire.

of it, I found that the matter was of no greater bulk or weight, than might receive an account in few words, and those most proper to be here annexed, by way of Appendix.

2. At the folding up of that Manual, the author of it is pleased to take notice of (no more than) one testimony, which I had cited out of Sir Henry Spelman's *Anglicane Councils*, containing an answer of the abbot of Bangor to Augustine the monk, when he demanded of the Britains an acknowledgment of submission to the bishop of Rome.

3. The passage is to be seen at large, in Welsh, English, and Latin, in that Tome of the Councils, p. 108, and is recited in the treatise of Schism, p. 111,* and the sum of it is; that he and the rest of the British church were under the government of the archbishop of Cærleon upon Usk, and owed no obedience (or respect, save that of fraternal charity) to the Pope of Rome.

4. This answer of that abbot, the author bath thought good to censure (by way of appendix to the article concerning the Pope's Supremacy) 1. As unapt to conclude against the Romanist's pretensions concerning the papal power over the whole church. 2. As unworthily alleged by persons of any ordinary judgment or erudition. 3. As that which may easily be convicted to be a simple imposture, and the ways of demonstrating it clearly, promised in that ensuing discourse.

* Hammond's Works, Vol. I. *Of Fundamentals, Schisme, and Herisie*, p. 354.

5. What those ways are, and how far short of the force or evidence of demonstration, I shall, with the reader's good leave, examine anon, after I have premised this one consideration, that the only thing, which is by us contested, and concluded against the Romanist from this testimony, is a matter of fact of known truth, and such as the Romanists themselves, (yea, and this author H. T. who hath thought fit to arraign this testimony) acknowledge to be such; and therefore, as in case this one testimony should be demonstrated to be a single imposture, we can very unconcernedly and easily part with it, standing in no manner of need of this auxiliary; so it is a little strange, that this author should think it worth his solemn pains, to wrest it out of our hands, and dedicate this whole appendix to that one work, when if he were successful to his wish, his acquisitions hereby, and proportionably our losses, must be so inconsiderable.

6. That which we conclude from hence against the Romanist, is no more but this, that the Britains, particularly those of Bangor, denied to yield obedience to the Pope, upon Augustine's demand of it. And for this, we have the notoriousness of the fact, as it is set down by the authors which are of credit, and are vouched in this matter by the Romanist, particularly by Bede, in the second book of his Ecclesiastical History, c. 2. where the whole story may be read at large, and out of which I shall collect, and, in passing, clear these few things.

7. First, that Augustine and the British bishops met in council at Augustine's Oak, in Worcestershire.

12. Thirdly, that for the convincing of them, Augustine challenged them to do miracles, and by prayer to God, cured a blind man, and was much cried up for so doing ; the British still adhering to their way, and answering them, that *absque consensu et licentia suorum*, without consent and license of their, whether rulers of church, or whatsoever other superiors, also (their metropolitan, I suppose, which cannot be thought to have been with them at this, being certainly none of the seven bishops, which are affirmed to have been present at the latter convention) they could not forsake their ancient customs.

13. Fourthly, that upon proposal, it was agreed that they should have a second meeting, at which were present seven British bishops (which other writers express to have been the bishop of Hereford, Landaff, Bangor, St. Asaph, Worcester, Paternensis, Morganensis), and many other learned men, especially *de nobilissimo eorum Monasterio, quod vocatur lingua Anglorum Bancornaburg*, cui tempore illo Dinooth abbas præfuisse narratur, of the famous monastery of Bangor, of which Dinooth was abbot at that time.

14. Fifthly, that before they went to this meeting, they were advised by a religious person, whose directions they asked, to observe diligently the behaviour of Augustine, when they came, whether he were meek and lowly in heart, a mark by which they might know whether he had taken Christ's yoke upon him, and, consequently, whether it were the yoke of Christ, which he now desired to impose upon them ;

and upon Augustine's sitting still upon his stool or seat, and never rising up with any civility or humility, at their approach, they were so displeased, saith Bede, that they contradicted all the proposal that he made to them.

15. Sixthly, that upon his making three propositions to them, concerning Easter, baptism, and preaching to the English, and promising to bear with them in all other differences, (of which sort, said he, there were many wherein their practice was contrary, *consuetudini nostræ, imo universalis Ecclesiæ*, to the custom of the Roman, yea the universal Church) they answered, *nihil horum se facturos, nec illum pro archiepiscopo habituros*, that they would not comply with him in any of them, nor acknowledge him for their archbishop; upon which follows that rough sanguinary answer of Augustine's, *Quod si pacem cum fratribus accipere nollent, bellum ab hostibus forent accepturi*, that if they would not accept of peace with brethren, they should have war from enemies; and, as it follows in very plain language, *per Anglorum manus ultionem mortis essent passuri*, the hands of the English should act a bloody revenge upon them.

16. Which, it seems, soon after followed, and fell in an eminent manner on the monks of Bangor, of which order there were at that time above two thousand, who lived all by the labours of their own hands. For, saith he, king Edilfred of Northumberland, coming with a great army to Caerleon, made

his first onset on their priests, who were assembled by themselves to fast and pray for their brethren (as Moses holding up his hands in prayer, whilst Joshua held up his in fighting), and upon no other provocation (taken notice of by the historian) but this, that they fought against him with their prayers (*contra nos pugnant qui adversus nos in precationibus prosequeuntur*), he first set upon them, killed twelve hundred of them, and then destroyed the whole army. Sicque completum est præsagium sancti Pontificis Augustini, and so the presage of the holy bishop St. Augustine was fulfilled upon them.

17. These particulars of the story I have thus punctually set down in obedience to the rebuke of this author, who, p. 412, chargeth it upon Sir Henry Spelman, and those others that borrow out of him, as a want of willingness to see the truth, and of fidelity to communicate it to others, that they have chosen to reflect on that testimony (which he is pleased to call *upstart*, and) which appeared not till within these fifteen years, and not upon that true antiquity, which having endured the shock of almost a thousand years, Sir Henry had a little before^f transcribed out of Bede,* wherein, saith he, every one may read, first, that miracle in giving sight to the blind man; then, that divine vengeance prophetically foretold by Augustine, which, in his opinion, more than sufficiently prove that St. Augustine, sent by the Pope, came in the name of God from lawful authority, and that his demands of conformity to the church of Rome in the

* P. 413.

points specified were good, and to be yielded to by the Britains.

18. In this matter I might now fitly enlarge, and examine the force of this two-fold argument, that of the miraculous cure, and that of the predicted vengeance, and offer many things to consideration concerning each head.

19. For the former, First, the no great credit that hath been given to the relations of Bede on this head of miracles, of which his story is so richly furnished, together with the great deceit that such pretensions have been experimented to subject men to. Secondly, the confession of Bede, that the Britains were * unwilling to yield to this trial of their causes; and accordingly when he saith that the † blind man being offered to the priests of the Britains, he received no cure or benefit by them, he doth not so much as pretend that the Britains attempted to do the miracle, and failed in it, but leaves us to resolve that they wholly waved this trial. Thirdly, that if the miracle were granted to be a true miracle, and a testimony of God's asserting the doctrines then contested between them, yet this would not be any concludent testimony for the *Pope's Supremacy*, but only for those things which were then the matter of the question, the time of the observation of Easter, the rites of baptism accustomed in the Roman church, and at the most some such like traditions, wherein the British custom varied

* Quod cum adversarii, inviti licet concederent.

† Cum oblatus Britonum sacerdotibus, nil curationis horum ministerio cepit.

from that of Rome; for this was the form of the proposed trial, *quæ sequenda traditio, quibus sit viis ad ingressum regni illius properandum, what tradition was to be followed* (in the celebration of Easter, *that* which the Britains had received and retained from their first conversion, imputed to an apostle or apostolical person, Simon Zelotes or Joseph of Arimathea, or *that* which the Romans deduced from St. Peter), *by what ways they were to hasten to entrance into that kingdom*, referring, I suppose, to the rites of baptism, the second head of debate between them. And in both these, as also in refusing to join with Augustine in the common work of preaching to the Gentiles, it may easily be granted by us, that the truth was on the Romanist's side, and not on the Britains', without yielding a supremacy of the church of Rome over the British churches. Fourthly, that the Britains, by Bede's confession, acknowledged themselves convinced by that miracle, that the way of righteousness which Augustine preached, was the true way, yet added, that they could not renounce their ancient customs *without the consent and licence of their own superiors*, which evidently confines and determines the miracle and all the supposed virtue thereof to the confirming the traditions which Augustine delivered, without further extending it to the asserting the Papal power, to which the abbot of Bangor's answer was particularly confronted, for had they once acknowledged themselves convinced of that, there had been no place left for the *licentia suorum*, no need of the consent or licence of any other superiors, which yet they resolutely adhere to. Lastly,

that at their second meeting, the Britains deemed Augustine's pride a more valid convincing argument, that the yoke which he designed to impose upon them, was not the yoke of Christ, than the supposed miracle, that it was.

20. And for the latter, that of the slaughter, first * threatened, and then fulfilled upon them. 1. If that were indeed a miracle, it was not of the complexion which is generally observed in Christ's miracles, used for the working of faith, but proportionable to the spirit of the Boanerges, which would have the fire from heaven called down upon the Samaritans, and were answered by Christ, that it was not agreeable to the spirit of the Gospel. And if the example of St. Peter on Ananias and Sapphira, or of St. Paul on Elymas, be made use of as a precedent for this severity, yet sure the answer of Pope Gregory to Augustine at that time, supposing different churches to enjoy different customs, and not imposing the Roman upon all, might have directed him to greater moderation. See Bede, l. 1. c. 27. in his answer to the third interrogation. Secondly, it is no very great miracle, that a grand army falling first upon unarmed monks should obtain the victory against them, and afterward against all other their opposers; nor consequently is it any whit strange that Augustine, that was so provoked, and meant to use this bloody revengeful course, should thus threaten what he then

* Fertur minitans prædixisse. Bede. Terruit eos vaticinio futuræ super eos calamitatis. Sigebert.

designed to see performed; for that is the full meaning of his foretelling it.

21. It is true indeed, that either Bede, or some interpolator that copied out the original Latin of that history, hath thought good to insert some words in the end of that story, l. 2. c. 2. in fine, (*quamvis ipso jam multo ante tempore ad cœlestia Regna sublato*) which might delude men into a persuasion, that this bloody act was a long time after Augustine's death, but for this, first it is observable that King Alfred's Saxon translation or paraphrase of Bede, wholly omits that parenthesis, and reads it only thus, *And swa toes gefylled se witedom does halgan B. Agustinus that hisceoldan, &c.* And so was fulfilled the prediction of S. Augustine, that they should feel the revenge of temporal destruction. Secondly, that the series of the story in Bede gives just prejudice to that parenthesis; for this of the slaughter of the Britains being set down in the end of the second chapter, the third begins with Augustine's ordaining two bishops, Mellitus and Justus, which sure was not after his death; and, as the Saxon paraphrase of King Alfred begins that chapter with this form of reference to the former passage, *Thæ was after thissum*, It was after this—which plainly defines Augustine to have survived that bloody fact. So the Latin Bede, which sets down the time of Augustine's ordaining those two bishops, *Anno Dominicæ incarnationis sexcentesimo quarto*, *In the year 604*, doth yet more incline us to suspect that parenthesis, for though Bede, who sets down the month and day of Augustine's death, sets not down the year

of it, but leaves it in a latitude to be between the year 596, in which he came to England, and the year 613, (or, as the Saxon reads, in 616) in which King Ethelbert died, yet others commonly affirm that he continued bishop fifteen or sixteen years, and so died about 612 or 613. Whereas chronologers affirm the slaughter of the monks of Bangor, &c. to have been in the year 603, and so the year immediately precedent to Augustine's ordaining two bishops. Thirdly; when in the relation of this slaughter, the Latin Bede begins, *Siquidem posthæc ipse, de quo diximus, Rex Anglorum*—For after this, *i. e.* after Augustine's threatening destruction to the British, the forenamed King of the Angles gathered an army. The Saxon paraphrase reads *and sona hrathe after thissum*, and *soon rath*, *i. e.* *very soon after this*; which again persuades that it was before Augustine's death, at least that the *jam multo ante* in the parenthesis (that Augustine died long before) could have no truth in it. Lastly, as some writers of these dark times have made a shift to affirm with the Latin Bede, that Augustine was first dead, so it is known also that others charge it on him, that he was not only the inciter to it, but that he met the Kings, when they were ready for the fight, and was present with them. And Trivet, in his French Chronicle, that saith it was done after Augustine's death; yet adds that Ethelbert, King of Kent, who stirred up Ethelfred, King of Northumberland, and his Saxons, against the Britains, and by name against Dinoth, abbot of Bangor forementioned, was highly displeased and inflamed, that he had despised

Augustine. All which being considered, it is certain, that this was no very Christian action, whether in Augustine or in Ethelbert, and the threats of the one, and performances of the other, as they bear an exact proportion, so are they equally argumentative, not for, but against that cause which was willing thus unchristianly to support itself.

22. Thirdly, if the slaughter of these poor monks shall yet be thought a solid probation, as an act of divine vengeance upon them (just such as the falling of the tower of Siloe was, from which none but a Jew, or Turk, or the Barbarians, Acts 28, or those that make prosperity the special mark of a true church, will think fit to conclude any thing), there is one part of the story yet behind, which will refute and retort that argument; for when Edilfrid had used them so bloodily, and in the heat of his rage and victory, proceeded to destroy the remainder of those monks and their monastery together, the avengers of blood met him; three British commanders with their forces, routed his army, killed ten thousand and sixty of them, wounded the king, and put him and the remainder of his army to flight; which certainly is an argument of as much validity to infer that God maintained the cause of those innocent monks against the Saxons and Augustine, as the former was argumentative on their side against the British.

23. But it is not needful that I insist on either of these; the one thing that from this view of the story in Bede was to be concluded, is only this, that upon the relations, as in him they lie, and are by this author,

H. T. vouched against us, there can be no doubt of our conclusion, that the abbot and monks of Bangor opposed Augustine, yielded him no obedience, referred themselves only to their own governors, *without any acknowledgment of obedience to the Pope*; and this is, generally, the result of other authors' narration of this matter.

24. So* Balæus, speaking of that convention, *Dinotus omnium primus graviter et docte de non approbata apud eos Romanorum autoritate disputabat—Dinoth in the first place gravely and learnedly disputed against the authority of the bishops of Rome among them ; adding, Fortiter præterea tuebatur Menevensis archiepiscopi in Ecclesiarum suarum rebus ratam jurisdictionem*, That he moreover strongly and courageously defended the validity of the jurisdiction of the archbishop of St. David's (the same that in the abbot's answer is called the bishop of Caerleon) in the affairs of his own churches.

25. So Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Edelbertus Rex Kantiorum, ut vidit Britones dedignantem subjectionem Augustino facere, Northumbrorum et cæteros Saxonum regulos instimulavit, ut collecto grandi exercitu in civitatem Bangor, abbatem Dinoth et cæteros Clericos, qui eos spreverunt, perditum irent*: King Ethelbert seeing the Britains disdain to yield their subjection to Augustine, stirred up the King of Northumberland and other Saxon Kings to gather a great army against the city of Bangor, to destroy Dinoth, the abbot, and

* In Dinoth.

the other clerks of that monastery, who had scorned Augustine and the Saxons.

26. So Sigebert, in anno 602. Augustinus——habita Synodo cum Britonum & Scotorum Episcopis, qua sacerdotes & monachos invenit adversarios æquitatis——Augustine had a meeting with the British and Scottish bishops, and there found an opposition from the priests and monks, and terrified them by prediction of a calamity that should fall on them. Other evidences to the same purpose are set down in the collection of the Anglicane Councils, and Mr. Whelock's Notes on his Edition of the Saxon Bede, p. 115, if there could now remain any question of it.

27. And that this was discerned by the author of this Appendix, if it had been for his interest to have taken notice of it, is evident by his mention of the miracle and divine vengeance, as of proofs that Augustine was in the right against these Refusers, who yet continued, saith he, still refractory to his proposals. And this was all I concluded from the abbot's answer, and this stands firm in this Romanist's own confession, though the words of the abbot's answer had not been preserved to us.

28. And therefore being now wholly unconcerned in the validity of this testimony, and so secured from all danger of being bribed by interests to judge more favourably of it than the matter requires, I shall now proceed calmly to consider, whether there be that clearness and evidence in this author's arguments for the invalidating this testimony, which he assures us we shall find in them.

29. His first argument is negative, (1.) from the not least scrap of antiquity so much as pretended to prove that the Cambrian (*i. e.* Welsh) lines cited, were the abbot of Bangor's answer to Augustine* upon the occasion specified, (2.) nor that the renowned Dinoth was that abbot, (3.) nor that the old Manuscript whence Sir Henry Spelman extracts the testimony, was copied out of any more ancient.

30. What other proof from antiquity should be expected from Sir Henry Spelman, to give authority to these lines, than what readily offers itself in this matter, I do not understand. That the British, particularly those of Bangor, and yet more peculiarly Dinoth, the famous abbot of that monastery, disputed against Augustine's pretensions for the authority of the bishop of Rome, and asserted their own subjection to their metropolitan, hath already appeared to be the affirmation of those who are most competent witnesses of it; and the manuscript passage in Welsh and English, which Sir Henry Spelman had transcribed from Mr. Moston's copy (and directs the reader to Sir Robert Cotton's library, to satisfy himself in that matter) is directly agreeable to this, for the matter of it, and so gave that very judicious knight just reason both to set some value on it himself, and to communicate it to others, as that which might gratify their curiosity, and approve itself by its own light to any judicious reader, to be, if not the very words of that abbot's answer, yet the sense and substance of it, and whether of these it should be judged to be, it matters not.

31. Had the contents of this testimony been any way contrary to other undoubted records of those times, or indeed any disparate new relation, that had not formerly been taken notice of, and was now to owe the whole credit and support to this testimony, some reason there might have been for an Aristarchus to proceed with more caution than here was used, and to yield nothing to bare groundless conjecture, (and the Romanist hath as much reason as any man to lay this to heart, to act with this caution in other testimonies) but when the matter is agreed on among the ancients, and an old record offers itself to our view, in perfect concord with that which we had formerly all reason to believe, and only affirms that more legibly and distinctly, which was in substance before, but not so punctually delivered to us, I cannot think the severest critic, supposing him unconcerned and impartial, without any hypothesis of his own to be defended or tended by him, would have any aversion or dislike to a testimony thus produced, though for some circumstances of it, such as are here mentioned, the producer have nothing of authority to back his own conjectures.

32. This one thing I am sure is most unjust, not to give credit to a manuscript, that it is what it pretends to be, unless I have some express affirmation of antiquity concerning that particular manuscript; should such rules of severity be now imposed on the press, the Vatican must never bring forth more rarities, the wealth of all the archives in the world must lie dead, like a miser's treasure, no one volume being able to

testify for the veracity of its neighbour, or if it were, itself must also bring its voucher along with it, and so on *in infinitum*, or else it would not be *ιστη μαρτυρια*, a competent testification in this matter; and when it is remembered, that all, which is now made public by the help of printing, lay once in single manuscripts, and those multipliable only by transcribing, and neither the originals nor copies any other way testified to be what they pretended to be, than as these Cambrian lines are delivered to us by Sir Henry, I hope this will be deemed a competent proof, that this first argument is not so clearly demonstrative as was promised.

33. Another branch there is of this first argument, in these words, *And certainly if his manuscript be no older than the interlined English, he hath grossly wronged himself and his reader, by honouring it with the stile of ancient; for as every one sees, the English is purely modern, and cannot be so old by many years as Henry VIII's cashiering the Pope's authority, and arrogating the supremacy in ecclesiastical matters to himself, for maintenance whercof it is alleged, and was certainly forged.

34. To this I answer briefly, that this is not pretended by Sir Henry, that the English is as ancient as the times of Dinoth, no nor the Welsh neither, but that those two languages were made use of by some, whose ages he pretends not to know, to convey to us intelligibly the answer of that abbot, in what language soever it were delivered by him. And it shall

now be granted to this author, that the English idiom evidenceth it to be written within these last hundred years, this can be no prejudice or ground of suspicion, much less a proof of forgery against this Manuscript, as long as the Welsh is allowed to be more ancient, to which the English may upon a latter transcribing have been annexed, as fitly as old Greek MSS. are daily printed with the Latin translations of a later date, in the same or several pages.

35. His second argument is deduced from the Cambrian Lines* in which he pretends to discover many un-Cambrian mixtures of English words, *helpio* and *gleimio*, for *help* and *claim*, want of orthography, and the like; to which, being utterly unskilful in the Welsh language, I acknowledge myself incompetent to give any very particular reply, yet shall give my reason, why I cannot think that this second argument of his is any more demonstrative against the validity of the testimony than the former; for, first, supposing this copy of Mr. Moston's to be a transcript, not the original, (as it is evident Sir Henry Spelman supposeth) what difficulty is there to imagine, that that copy was transcribed by one unskilful in the orthography of that language, especially when it is known how ordinary this is to be found, not only among the vulgar, but among learned churchmen of that nation, who are fain by study to acquire skill of reading before they can officiate in that language. Secondly, I shall readily grant, or, if he please, yield to the force of his arguments, that the Welsh lines

* P. 406, 7, 8.

are not the words or language wherein Dinoth delivered his answer, but (as this gentleman after contends) that Dinoth, a writer of Latin Books, being to speak to Augustine, that understood not the British language, gave his answer in Latin. What hinders now, but that this Latin answer being conserved among the Britains, might in later times (before Henry VIII.) in any age to which the idiom of the Welsh lines shall direct a critic in that language to affix them, be translated into imperfect (I mean more modern) yet intelligible Welsh, either by a native of that country, or by any other who had acquired so much of that language, as was sufficient for no weightier an enterprise: I discern not what disadvantage I can receive by this concession; and sure there will be small difficulty in vindicating Sir Henry's integrity, if this shall be supposed; for he no where pretends, that the Cambrian lines, in the form here presented, were the language or words of the answer of Dinoth, but that the matter of his answer, in what language soever delivered by him, is communicated to us by that MS. And that it was not, here is no word of so much as probable argument, much less of clear demonstration tendered by the author of this Appendix.

36. Lastly, for the two words which occasioned his charge of the English mixtures, I am, by those which have skill in the language, enabled to return him some answer, that the word *help*, from whence is the infinitive *helpio* or *helpu*, is found used by Tudor Aled, who wrote An. 1490, and by Llywelyn, who is thought to be more ancient, and that *gleimio*, or

cleimia, is by the Latin and Welsh dictionary * set down in the word *vendico*, in the first place, (and after that *holi*) as the most proper Welsh word for it, not borrowed from the English; from whence, as I shall not conclude, that these Welsh lines were the original of Dinot's answer, (that were to retract my former concession) so I may safely assume, that these two words (his only instances of English mixtures) do no way demonstrate this Welsh translation to be later than Henry VIII.'s cashiering the Pope's authority, (as of the English it was granted) nor consequently leave it under suspicion of being forged by any Protestant.

37. His third argument is of more seeming force, taken from the mention of this abbot's subjection to the Bishop of Caerleon upon Uske, in which he finds two absurdities. 1. Saith he,† Bangor is very near if not in the diocess of Llan Elwy, now commonly called S. Asaph. 2. All histories testify that the archiepiscopal seat was removed from Caerleon to St. David's in King Arthur's time, who died about the year 544, *i. e.* fifty years before Augustine's first entrance into Britain.

38. To these two branches of probation, certainly the answer is very obvious to the first, that, acknowledging, and supposing that the monastery of Bangor, situate in Flintshire, though within the confines of Cheshire, was under the diocesan bishop, either of S. Asaph or of Chester, (the episcopal see of Bangor

* A Jo. Davies, SS. Th. D. A. D. 1632.

† P. 409.

lying in the county of Caernarvon) yet this can be of no manner of force against this testimony ; for he that was under the bishop of S. Asaph, as his immediate superior, or Diocesan, may yet be under the bishop of Caerleon, as his metropolitan, as he that is under the bishop of Rochester, in one respect, is under the bishop of Canterbury in another. And so that is a full answer to his first difficulty.

39. For the second, it is acknowledged that before this time of Dinot's answer to Augustine, the archiepiscopal see had been by authority of synod removed first from Caerleon to Landaff by Dubritius, anno 512, and so it is affirmed by Sir Henry Spelman, in his Apparatus, p. 25, (where by the way, line 5, the printer hath mistaken *ad Meneviam* for *ad Landaviam*) and in like manner by his successor S. David, anno 516, by licence from King Arthut, from Landaff to Menevia, which from that eminent bishop, under whom that change was made, was after called S. David's. But this removal of the metropolitanical see from one city to another was not of such weight, or consideration, but that the metropolitanical dignity, having been so long fixed at Caerleon, might still retain that title after the translation.

40. Besides, the abbot of Bangor making answer to Augustine's claim, which was founded in some old right, which he pretended the Pope to have over all churches, it was most proper to contest this by former practice, not only how it stood at that present, but especially how it had been *αἰῶθεν ἢ ἐξ ἀρχῆς*, of old, or from the beginning, by custom immemorial, and

herein not to consider such immaterial changes, as were the removing of the primate's see from one city to another, but to look on it, as it had always lain, in opposition to all foreign jurisdiction. And it being certain that Caerleon was anciently this prime see, nothing was more agreeable to this contest, as it is supposed to be managed by that abbot, than thus to refer to the *αρχαία ηδη* (as the councils of Nice, and Antioch, and Chalcedon, and Ephesus had done, in the like controversies) to tell Augustine that the British Christians had always, from their first plantation, been under a British primate, and to call the British primate by that title, which had most anciently belonged to him, i. e. bishop of Caerleon, and not by the later of Landaff, or the yet later of S. David's.

41. What this author here objects against the former of these answers, saying, 1. That this is not proved—and 2. that it implies a contradiction, to say, the see was translated, and the former title still retained, translation importing the taking anew and desertion of the old title, is no way applicable to this second answer, (which, consequently, remains in full force) and therefore I need not farther attend to it; and in relation to the former answer, it is far from the promised clearness of demonstration.

42. For as to the first part of it, the thing may be true, though it be not proved; the contrary must be proved by him that promiseth clear or demonstrative confutations: and for the second, it must be founded in some new notion of contradiction, which my logic hath not acquainted me with; for sure he

that saith the see was translated, and the former title retained, doth neither say that the see was translated, and not translated, (which is the only form of a logical contradiction) nor that the former title was retained, and not retained; nor, consequently, can I discern the least inconvenience, much less contradiction, either direct, or by way of implication, that the metropolitical see being translated from Caerleon to another city, the metropolitan should still retain his original title, that of bishop of Caerleon.

43. Other exceptions he proceeds to add, * but those so far again from being, according to promise, demonstrative evidences against this testimony, that they are no way worthy to be attended to.

44. First, that Elinoth would probably have answered in Latin; and to that I have already replied, that I may well grant he did so, and, consequently, that both the Welsh and English in Mr. Moston's MS. were translations of that Latin.

45. Secondly, that the words in Welsh rendered *whom you name to be Pope*—are not rightly translated; in this again I cannot contend, having no knowledge in that language, but as before I followed Sir Henry's translation, and finding it not very clear, did endeavour to express his meaning by a just paraphrase, and thereby happily rendered the true sense of the place, so if I should now believe my teacher again, this author, that undertakes to correct Sir Henry's translation, it would not be possible so to render the words, as should bear a very commodious sense, and

* P. 410.

perfectly agreeable to the notion I formerly had of them.

46. But being not secure that my leader H. T. (whom now I discern to be no Welshman) hath really the skill in that language, which his animadversions pretend to, I thought it more reasonable to consult some other more knowing guide, and am now from a judicious hand assured, that there is an error in the distinction between Daad, and *yw gleimio*, which being taken away, the true rendering of the whole is this, *Et aliam obedientiam, quam istam, non agnosco ego cujusquam esse, quem vòs nominatis Papam, vel patrem patrum, vendicare et postulare, And any other obedience than that, I acknowledge not to be any man's (or to belong to any man) whom ye name Pope, or Father of Fathers, to challenge and require.* This is plain sense, and still perfectly agreeable to the understanding I formerly had of the words, and I doubt not but upon the most critical examination, it will be found to be the most literal rendering of them.

47. The third, of the no good sense of the English, is already answered also by adhering to that better translation, which is as perfectly fit for our turns, as the other was imagined to be, and much more intelligible and clear, as appeared in the last number.

48. The fourth is, that the words used of the bishop of Caerleon, *who is to oversee (under God) over us*, makes against the aim of the prelatie reformers, and particularly against me, who labour to support the King's supremacy against the Pope, whereas these words exclude the King as well as the Pope. But

certainly there is no force in this, for Augustine's demand, or question being only of that obedience and subordination which belonged to the supreme Bishop, whether that were the Bishop of Rome or the Bishop of Caerleon, and not at all inquiring into the nature or extent of the regal or imperial power, (there being no occasion to suggest any such inquiry) the abbot's answer can in no probability be extended any farther than the question extended, *i. e.* to the asserting the prime episcopal power to belong to the metropolitan of Caerleon or S. David's, without any subordination to the Pope of Rome.

49. As for that which in the fifth place he adds of the miracle and divine vengeance, in Bede, and so concludes his appendix, to that I have spoken * already, in that which I thought meet to premise to this debate, and so I have no more to add by way of answer to his exceptions, but that I cannot sufficiently wonder, that this author, so recommended to the reader by his learned friend in the front of his book, should make it his solemn business to invalidate this one supernumerary testimony, being withal no better provided with arguments to promise him success in it.

* No. 19, 20.

THE CASE STATED, BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF ROME AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

A CONVERSATION BETWIXT AN ENGLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC NOBLEMAN, AND A GENTLEMAN HIS FRIEND OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. WHEREIN IS SHEWED, THAT THE DOUBT AND THE DANGER IS IN THE FORMER, AND THE CERTAINTY AND SAFETY IN THE LATTER COMMUNION.

BY CHARLES LESLIE, A. M.

Lord. It is hard that by your late act of Parliament I must either lose my estate or change my religion.

Gentleman. I think your lordship ought not to lose your estate till you have first considered how far your conscience will allow you to conform to what is required of you.

L. If I thought I could save my soul in the church of England, I would think myself obliged to preserve my right and posterity.

G. Pray, my lord, what is there in the communion of the church of England should make you think your soul in any danger? Would there be any hazard of

your soul if there were no invocation of saints that are dead in the public offices of the church : no pictures or images of God to be seen there : no elevation of the host, which was but of late years brought into the church : no prayers for souls out of purgatory : if the public prayers were in the vulgar tongue : and if the sacrament were given in both kinds ? For these are all the differences you will find betwixt your public offices and ours.

L. But I must keep in the communion of the church, else I think I cannot save my soul.

G. Your lordship means in the communion of the church of Rome.

L. Yes, for she is the mother church, and centre of unity to all other churches, insomuch that who are not of her communion, are out of the pale of the Catholic church.

G. My lord, it is certain that Jerusalem was the mother church, where Christ first planted the Gospel, and commanded that it should be thence propagated to all other nations, as he himself said, “beginning at Jerusalem,” Luke xxiv. 47. And till after the vision of the sheet to St. Peter, Acts x, no Gentile was admitted; as it is said, Acts xi. 19 : “they travelled — preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only.” So that the Jewish Christian church was the only church for some time, and she it was who converted the Gentile nations, and therefore was the mother church to them all.

And Rome was not the first Gentile church, for “the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch,”

Acts xi. 26. And the Greek church was before the Latin ; the New Testament was wrote in Greek for their use, therefore the Greek church could not be the daughter of the Latin church, which was born after her.

L. But St. Peter having been bishop of Rome, and Christ having constituted him to be the head of the Catholic church throughout the whole world, the same must descend to his successors the bishops of Rome.

G. This will not make her the mother church. You may call her *supreme, absolute, universal*, or what you please, any thing but the mother church, to which it is impossible she should have any title.

In the conversion of the Gentiles to Christianity, one man and one nation, must receive the faith before another, they were not all converted on a day. And, as when one man converts another, so it is of churches and nations, it gives the one no superiority over the other, except that of gratitude and esteem, but nothing of authority.

But whatever the privilege of the mother church may be, if it can be translated from the mother to the daughter, from one church to another, from Jerusalem to Antioch, and thence to Rome, as you must be obliged to say ; then it may be translated from Rome also to some other church, unless some positive command of Christ can be produced, first to fix it at Rome, and then a promise that it shall never thence be removed. But the church of Rome is not once named in all the New Testament, unless she

is meant by the "Church at Babylon," 1 Pet. v. 13. Nor is there any promise whatsoever made to her, or any the least intimation of her being the head of the churches, the standard and centre of unity to them all. Strange! if that be the *summa rei Christianæ*, as Bellarmine calls it (in the preface to his book *de Romano Pontifice*), the "sum and foundation of the Christian Religion."

And as silent are the Scriptures concerning the supposed universal supremacy of St. Peter, or that he ever was at Rome or bishop of Rome. Some after writers have mentioned it; but that is far from such an universal tradition as is sufficient for the mighty superstructure which is raised upon it. But let it be granted, it signifies nothing, because all is founded upon some words said to St. Peter, such as, "Thou art Peter—Feed my sheep—" &c. which cannot be strained to such an universal supremacy as the Popes have claimed, nor were so understood in the primitive church. For which I refer your lordship to a book I know you value, and favoured me with the perusal of it; the learned Monsieur du Pin his *Traité de la Puissance Ecclésiastique & Temporelle*, printed at Paris, 1707, where p. 495 to 501, and p. 754 to p. 765, you will find all these texts urged for the supremacy of St. Peter, answered in the same manner as is done by the Protestant writers, and it is shewed how very foreign they are from the purpose intended.

And that the rock upon which Christ said he would build his* church was not Peter, but the faith which

* Matth. xvi. 18.

Peter then confessed, your lordship may see the current sense of the Fathers, and consult at your leisure, *St. Augustine, de Verb. Dom. Ser. 13. Nazianzen de Vet. Testam. St. Cyril, de Trin. lib. 4. St Chrysostom, Hom. 55. in Matth. St. Ambrose, Com. in Ephes. 2. Hilary, de Trin. lib. 2. cap. 6.* And there are many others.

But nothing that was said of St. Peter is so express for an universal supremacy as what St. Paul said of himself, 2 Cor. xi. 28, “that the care of all the churches lay upon him.” And again, 1 Cor. vii. 17, “so ordain I in all churches.” If such a decretal could be produced of St. Peter’s, I doubt not it would have been made use of towards proving his universal supremacy. In the Acts of the Apostles it is told that St. Paul was at Rome preaching the gospel for two whole years together, Acts xxviii. 30, 31; but not a word of St. Peter’s being there. And as St. Paul planted the gospel at Rome, so he wrote to the church there as his particular charge, for, says he, Rom. xi. 13, “I speak to you Gentiles, in as much as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office.” But St. Peter was the apostle of the Jews, they were his particular charge; and he himself allowed “that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to Paul, as the gospel of the circumcision was to himself,” Gal. ii. 7, 8, 9. And accordingly he directed his epistle to the Jews of the dispersion who were “strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.” But he wrote not to the Gentiles, particularly not to Rome, which would seem

strange if he had been bishop of Rome, and that had been his chief and principal charge. And St. Paul's both "withstanding him to the face" before the whole church of Antioch, in behalf of the Gentiles whom he had misled, "fearing them who were of the circumcision," shews the care St. Paul took of those who were more particularly his charge; and seems a behaviour not very suitable to the supreme head of the church both Jews and Gentiles, if St. Paul had known any thing of St. Peter's being so constituted by Christ.

And as little had it become the other apostles to send their sovereign upon business, as they sent Peter to Samaria, Acts, viii. 14.

But if, as some say, St. Peter was bishop of the Jewish converts at Rome, and St. Paul of the Gentiles there, St. Paul would have had a much greater flock than St. Peter, and the successors of St. Paul, and not of St. Peter, must have been bishops there, because the church of Rome is now, and has long been all of the Gentiles.

But the surest way to find out the truth is by fact, and not straining expressions, which may have several meanings. The eastern monarchs have used to give themselves mighty titles, as Son of the Sun, and Brother of the Stars, and King of all the Kings of the Earth, &c. But will any believe that any of them was the universal monarch for all this, contrary to plain fact?

Pray, my lord, let me ask you, do you think one could write the history of a King, suppose of King

Charles the 2d, and in all the history neither call him *king*, mention his restoration, coronation, or tell of one *regal* act ever he did, as calling a parliament, or presiding in it, sending or receiving an ambassador, or granting a commission? &c. And so of a pope, could his history be wrote without calling him *pope*, or telling of one *papal* act of his?

L. No, it is impossible, for such an history could not be called the history of a king, or of a pope.

G. Now, my lord, let me apply this. We have the history of the Acts of the Apostles, in which St. Peter has a great share, though not so much as St. Paul, and there is a council mentioned wherein both of them were present, and there is not a tittle of any superiority of St. Peter over St. Paul, or any other of the apostles, either in that council, or any where else throughout that whole history, which, as your lordship has determined, is impossible if St. Peter had that supremacy which the popes have claimed as his successors.

This is so demonstrative a proof that the writers on your side think it necessary for them to endeavour some solution to it. But the weakness of their answer is a yet greater confirmation on our side. For they can find no other way to get some superiority to St. Peter in this council than to suppose that he opened it, because, as they say, he spoke first, which would not infer the supremacy they intend, if it were true; but it is plainly otherwise; for it is said, Acts, xv. 7, "and when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up and said."——Nor did he speak last;

for after he had done Paul and Barnabas declared the conversion of the Gentiles, by their means, without putting them under the law, which was the point in debate; and after they held their peace, St. James who was bishop of Jerusalem, where the council was held, did, as president, resume what had been said by St. Peter and others, and gave his definitive sentence upon the whole, “wherefore my sentence is—” And the decree of the council was drawn up in the words of St. James. So that it is plain he closed the council, whoever opened it or spoke first, which is not so material as to be told in this account of that council. But dismissing the council, and putting an end to it seems of greater authority. If what is said of St. James here had been said of St. Peter, I question not it would have been made use of as a full proof of his supremacy, and presiding in that council.

L. I must confess the history of the New Testament is very barren, as to facts relating to the authority of St. Peter over the other apostles. We must depend upon the texts before mentioned of “feed my sheep,” &c.

G. None of these texts are so express as what I quoted of St. Paul. But if they were meant in that extent for which you produced them, it is impossible but that must appear in the facts of St. Peter, especially in the part he bore in that council at Jerusalem. And facts are the surest explanation of words.

We discourse now only of *authority*, what authority one apostle had over another, for that is the point wherein we are concerned. We speak not of

their gifts and graces, and their labours in propagating the gospel, wherein one might be more eminent and successful than another, but this gave him no authority over the others. And in this also St. Paul had the preference, for "he laboured more abundantly than they all," 1 Cor. xv. 10. And all the Epistles almost are his, to the several churches. And his miracles and conversions of infidels take up a much greater part in the Acts of the Apostles than those of St. Peter.

I have said so much of this matter, because the supposed supremacy of St. Peter, his being at Rome, and bishop of Rome, is the whole foundation of that supremacy claimed by the bishop or church of Rome.

And if that be so essential a point, and upon which the unity of the church depends, insomuch that without it there is no church at all, according to the scheme drawn by modern Rome, it is inconceivable the scriptures should be so wholly silent in it, nay, shewing the very contrary in fact, as I have said already concerning St. Peter. And when the direct question was put to our blessed Saviour, upon the contest among the apostles which of them should be the greatest, Luke, xxii. 24, I say if this was so material a point as to the very being of the church, it is inconceivable he should not have determined it, but by his answer rather checked the error of their thought, and left them all upon the level.

L. I would gladly know your notion of the unity of the church, if all bishops, as you say of the

apostles, were upon the level, without any head bishop, or principle of unity among them; for we are told that Christ has but one church upon earth.

G. Your lordship may add, and in heaven too; for all are one church to Christ, of which he alone is the head. And one part being militant, the other triumphant, makes them not two churches, but two states of the same church; which is called “one family in heaven and earth.” Eph. iii. 15. In like manner, heaven, earth, and hell are one kingdom to the great creator, for “his kingdom ruleth over all.” And of the earth it is said, “the kingdom is the Lord’s, and he is the governor among the nations,” Psal. xxii. 28. All the nations are one kingdom to him. But he has appointed no universal monarch as his deputy of his kingdom of the earth, but each nation is governed by their respective rulers, independent of each other. For so his wisdom has disposed, according to the capacity of his creatures, for what man would be sufficient to govern the whole world? And where must the seat be of this universal monarch? Must he not have as many or more deputies under him as there are now kings or nations? And what prudence could prevent defections and rebellions in far distant provinces? This has overthrown great monarchies, which have fallen with their own weight. What then could support an universal monarchy, when nations go to war, other neighbour kings and states may interpose, assist the oppressed, be mediators and guarantees of peace. *But* this could not be in case of defection from the

universal monarch, for who assist rebels are rebels themselves. And such wars could not but end in the utter destruction of the one side or the other. Therefore God has consulted best for the peace and safety of mankind in distributing the world into several independent governments, rather than to put all under the dominion of one.

L. But when nations are at war, where is the unity of this one kingdom of God upon earth?

G. It is disturbed where those wars are. But it is not yet totally dissolved: for there are laws of war, wherein all agree. There is still what we call the law of nations, which as it maintains commerce in peace, so it regulates the fury of war. And there is one unity which nothing can dissolve, that is, "God having made of one blood all nations upon the earth." So that here is an unity of relation, of humanity, and of common principles which all retain.

L. But how is this unity kept?

G. Not as it should be. But so as is consistent with our fallen state, and the corruptions of mankind. It is not such an unity as is in God's kingdom of heaven; which yet was once disturbed by rebellion.

L. But there ought to be a stricter unity in the church than in the temporal world?

G. I wish it were so, but alas it is not. And the frailty of man shews itself in the church as well as in the state. The many heresies and divisions in the church have rent her to pieces and broke her unity, as much as wars have that of the temporal world.

L. That is for not adhering to the head and universal monarch of the church.

G. No, my lord, it is that pretence in the church of Rome has been the great cause of these divisions. It has procured peace in the church, just as setting up an universal monarchy would in the world, that is, fill it with more confusion and bloodshed than ever was in it, or could otherwise possibly be. For which reason God has appointed no universal monarch in the church more than in the state. For as Gregory the Great said to John Bishop of Constantinople (who, upon the seat of the empire being translated thither, set up for an universal supremacy in the church), “if the church should come to depend upon one, it must suddenly fall.” And St. Cyprian said, “that therefore Christ made the college of bishops numerous, that if one should fall or turn heretical, the rest might interpose for the saving of the flock:” for he says, “there is but one flock, and one episcopat,” of which every bishop has the whole in partnership with the rest. *Episcopatus unus est, cujus à singulis in solidum pars tenetur.* This was the frame of the church in his days, and before from the apostles; this was the very state of the apostles themselves, who thus shared of the apostolat, the whole of which was given to each, in partnership, or in common with the rest.

L. This then is your notion of the church;—that, as all nations upon the earth are one kingdom to God, so all Christian churches are one church to Christ, without any universal monarch in either case. And

that as the unity of the world consists in what we call the Law of Nations, which is common to all ; so the unity of the church consists in the common Christianity, wherein all agree.

If so, then every one who believeth in Christ is a Christian.

G. Yes, surely, as every one that believeth in Mahomet is a Mahometan.

L. Then there is no need to be of any church, if you believe in Christ that is enough.

G. No, we must obey his commandments too, which oblige us to live peaceably and quietly as members of that body or church whereto we appertain, with Christian love and fellowship with all others, and not to make schisms and divisions by breaking communion, where nothing sinful is required as a condition of it. And when such disorderly persons are cast out of the church, or cut themselves off by a causeless separation, though they are no longer of the church, yet they cease not to be Christians ; (that is a nostrum of the church of Rome) and they must answer for their schism as for other sins, all of which are damnable in their own nature, without repentance : and yet allowances are made for invincible ignorance occasioned by the prejudices of education, &c. but not for obstinacy. No society of men would bear such perverse members among them.

Now a church is a society professing such a religion, be it true or false. Thus there is a church of the Jews, of Heathens, of Christians, and Mahometans. And I would ask your lordship which is any of

these churches, for instance, which is the church of the Mahometans ?

L. It is the Turks, Moors, Persians, the Great Mogul, &c.

G. Yet there is no chief priest over all these, but every church as nation is independent of each other. And thus among the several nations and churches of the heathens. The Jews were but one nation, and a small one, therefore they had as one king, so one high priest. There was something like this in that part of the Christian church which was within the Roman empire. But to extend the supremacy of the bishop of Rome beyond the limits of the Emperor of Rome, even to all the Christian churches in the world, is a fancy never came into the heads of any other mortals, and is not necessary to denominate many churches professing the same religion to be one church, as of the Heathens and Mahometans, all of which are called the Heathen, or the Mahometan church or churches ; without any common head over them all. And there is not one word in scripture appointing such an universal head in the Christian church, or altering this common sentiment of mankind, as to the meaning of the word church, or taking it in any other sense than commonly understood by all the world. And thus in our way of speaking, when we say the fathers of the church, or the primitive church, we mean not any particular church, but the whole body or church of Christians, though divided into many nations or churches.

L. But all in subordination to the church of Rome.

G. What! before there was a church of Rome? For there were Christian churches before, as I have told you. And after there was a church at Rome, the bishops and fathers of those times knew nothing of its supremacy, far less of its infallibility, nor ever appealed to it in their disputes with heretics, which had been the shortest and surest way, and impossible to have been forgot, had it been known, and received as the current faith, or but opinion of the church. But, on the contrary, other churches have contended with that of Rome, and asserted their own liberties and independency upon her, when her encroachments began to arise and disturb the peace and unity of the church, which I shall shew you presently. But this is only to let you see, that the unity of the church was then understood, not as being united under any one supreme bishop or church, but in the concord and good agreement of the several churches among themselves, and in the unity of the common faith. Which unity is described by their all having “*one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, and one Spirit,*”* from which they are called one body. The unity of the Spirit is their unity with God, and the bond of peace is the unity of the churches with each other, as members of the same body. And this is a much stricter and closer union than that of the secular world. All churches agree in that summary of our faith called the Apostles Creed. And the church of Rome herself must think this sufficient for salvation, because she requires no

* Eph. iv. 3. 4. 5.

other profession of faith in baptism, or for being admitted into the church. But the twelve new articles of faith which the Council of Trent has added to the twelve of the Apostles, which we call Pope Pius's Creed, and is required to be professed by converts, has made many contests and divisions in the church ; and I have not yet met with any Roman Catholic so hardy as to say, that the belief of all these is necessary to salvation, only that we should not deny or oppose them, such as purgatory, the invocation of saints, &c.

L. The church pretends not to make new articles of faith, but only to explain the old ones. And such are what you call the new articles of Trent.

G. What article in the Apostles' Creed does transubstantiation explain? for there is nothing at all of the sacraments in that creed.

L. Are not the sacraments then part of our faith?

G. They are the signs and seals of our faith as circumcision was called, Rom. iv. 11. but not the faith itself, and therefore are not put into that summary of our faith.

L. But are they not necessary to salvation?

G. They are *generally necessary*, as our catechism words it, that is, to be reverently used when they may be had: but they are not *absolutely necessary*, so that if our circumstances, or places where we live are such as not to afford us the opportunity of receiving the sacraments, we should be damned for want of them. I think none will say this. They are means of God's appointment, therefore to be used, when we

can have them; we are tied to this, but God is not tied to those means to which He ties us. He can save without them.

L. But we have seven sacraments, and you have but two.

G. That is, we take the word sacrament in a stricter sense than you do. And of the five which you have more than we, you cannot say that they are so much as *generally necessary* to salvation, because none can partake of them all, for your sacrament of orders excludes all the laity, and that of marriage the clergy.

L. It is a sad thing that the church should be divided about these matters. But we are all one, you are miserably divided. How many sects or churches are there among you?

G. Not so many as with you.

L. How can that be? We have but one church which we own as such.

G. If a church is answerable for all that break off from her, then you have all these sects to reckon for, and us too, which is one more.

L. A church is not answerable for those who break off from her, because they are no longer of her.

G. Then we are not answerable for these sects which break off from our church.

L. But we are all one among ourselves.

G. So is every church or sect, that is, those who agree among themselves, do agree! So that this is no more a mark of unity than every division of men can plead, and every sect.

L. But we are the great body of Christians from which all broke off.

G. No, my Lord, not the half, or ever were: the Greek church is an elder church than yours, so that you rather broke off from her, by setting up your universal supremacy; which she never owned, nor the many other numerous churches in Asia; nor the great and once famous churches in Africa; nor the empire of Russia of vast extent in Europe, once a part of the Greek church. These never owned the supremacy of Rome, and by far outnumber all that ever did own it, or were of her communion as such. And considering how many kingdoms and nations have broke off from her since the Reformation, her communion is now reduced to a very small part of the Christian church, in comparison of those who differ from her.

L. But those other churches do not all communicate with each other.

G. Nor Rome with any of them. So that she stands by herself, as other churches do. And the most irreconcilable of any, because by her principles she cannot communicate with any who will not own her supremacy. Which as it never was done by the greatest part of the Catholic church, so there is little appearance that ever it will be; for it is observable that no nation which broke off from Rome did ever return to her again. It is a hard matter for one that has escaped out of a snare, to be inveigled thither again. So that it is very visible Rome has been upon the losing hand about these two hundred years past. And that not only as to those who have quite forsaken

her, but as to the change of principles and lowering her supremacy and infallibility amongst those who still remain in her communion, which I shall shew your lordship presently, and that old and new popery are very different things, and that Rome itself has in some measure been reformed by our Reformation.

I know nothing should hinder me from communicating with the Greek church, if I were there, while nothing sinful were required of me as a condition of communion, nor new creeds to be imposed on me: and so of the churches of St. Thomas, the Jacobites, and others in the east of Asia; of whom we have very imperfect and uncertain accounts: and so of the Abyssines, the Cophties, and other churches in Africa, the great church of Russia in Europe, &c. But Rome, while she pretends to universal supremacy, can communicate with none but with herself. So that our communion is much more extended or extendable than that of Rome. And this universal supremacy is that which most of any one thing in the world, hinders the union and communion of Christian churches.

L. But though one church may be supreme, yet the best part of the Roman Catholics place not the infallibility there, but in a general or oecumenical council where all churches meet.

G. There never was such a council. The Roman empire had the vanity to call itself the *Oikumene*, which we translate, *all the world*, Luke, ii. 1. Hence the councils called within that empire stiled them-

selves oecumenical, but no more truly so, than the Roman empire was all the world. But the Latin church was not so much as the *Oikumene* of the empire, for Greece and other parts of the Greek church in Asia were in it, especially after the seat of the empire was translated to Constantinople; when they contended with Rome for the supremacy. And the Latin church was not then called by the name of the church of Rome, as the learned du Pin says in his *Traité de la Puissance Ecclésiastique*, &c. p. 551. "It is true (says he) that at present the name of the church of Rome is given to the Catholic church, and that these two terms pass for synonymous. But in antiquity no more was intended by the name of the church of Rome, than the church of the city of Rome, and the Popes in their subscriptions or superscriptions took simply the quality of bishops of Rome. The Greek schismatics seem to be the first who gave the name of the church of Rome, to all the churches of the West; whence the Latins made use of this to distinguish the churches which communicated with the church of Rome, from the Greeks who were separated from her communion. From this came the custom to give the name of the church of Rome to the Catholic church. But the other churches did not for this lose their name, or their authority, &c." Then he goes on to vindicate the rights of every national church, independent of the church of Rome, and past her power to controul or alter. And the *Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris*, p. 45, 46, Appendix, tells the Pope that his bishoprick extends only to the diocess of Rome, and his patriarchat to those

provinces called *Suburbicarian*. And that by taking upon him to excommunicate others unjustly, and where his power did not reach, he had excommunicated himself. And then he was so far from being head, that he was not so much a member of the church. And they mind him, as likewise du Pin in the treatise before mentioned, p. 263, of the stout resistance made by the bishops of France to the Pope who threatened to excommunicate all of them that would not submit to his decision ; but they resolutely answered, that they would not submit to his will, and that if he came there to excommunicate them, he should go back excommunicated himself. *Si excommunicaturus veniret, excommunicatus abiret*. Now what is that head can be excommunicated by its members ? What is that supremacy can be limited and controuled by its subjects, and of which they are the judges, and can say to it, as God to the sea, “ hitherto shalt thou come and no farther, here shall thy proud waves be stayed ? ”

L. The church of France place the absolute supremacy and the infallibility, not in the Pope or church of Rome, but in a General Council.

G. Which, as I told you, never was, and it is next to impossible ever should be.

And this gives up your whole foundation, for the popes and not councils pretend to be the successors of St. Peter, and heirs of all the promises made to him.

In the next place, you are not agreed among yourselves concerning general councils. Bellarmin (*de Concil. l. 1. c. 6.*) gives a list of general councils which

are to be rejected, *concilia generalia reprobata*, some for not being approved by the Pope, some for heresy, and some (he might have said all) as not being received by the universal church, but he meant only the church of Rome. And chap. 7 is of General Councils, partly confirmed, and partly reprobated. And chap. 8. is of a General Council neither manifestly approved, nor manifestly rejected. This is going through all the degrees of uncertainty. And c. 5. and de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 11. he says, the several things in those councils allowed to be general were foisted in by heretics, he knows not how. This was to get rid of some objections against these councils he could not answer otherwise. And (de Eccles. Milit. c. 16.) he quotes the last council of Lateran condemning the council of Basil, which he says was at first a true œcumenical council, and infallible, but afterwards turned to a schismatical conventicle, and was of no authority at all. The church of France receive the councils of Basil and Constance wholly and throughout: but the church of Rome reject both in part. So that they who place the infallibility in councils, will need another infallible judge to determine these disputes concerning the councils; which are truly general, and which not; and which are partly so, and which throughout; and what part of those that are throughout have been corrupted by heretics, if that can be called true throughout which is corrupted in any part. And when one council condemns another, which shall we believe? And if we must not believe every council that calls itself œcumenical, we can believe no other council against it,

for the same reason. The second council of Ephesus is generally condemned in your church; yet it called itself œcumenical, and was as much so as any of the others. And what a thing is it to say, that a council is partly right and partly wrong? And who is judge of that? Is there any certainty in this, far less infallibility? And we must have an infallible method too to preserve the acts of these councils, that they be not adulterated, as Bellarmin says they have been; and they continue so to this day in the volumes of their councils. Why then are they not amended, and these suppositions and adulterated parts (these are Bellarmin's own words) struck out? But the several editions of their councils are in the hands of other churches, and therefore they can make no alteration in them without being detected.

So that the scheme of the infallibility you place in your councils stands thus; the church of Rome makes herself the universal or Catholic church, insomuch that all who are not of her communion (which are by far the greatest part of the Christian churches in the world) are out of the pale of the Catholic church: and schismatics and heretics are no part of a Catholic council: thus a small part of the Latin church (exclusive of the Greek and all other churches) is the whole Catholic church, and these little party councils, under the direction of the Pope, are universal and infallible!—But, as is shewn, the church of Rome has no right to the title of the Latin church itself, far less of the universal. And she has now but a small part of the Latin church left her. The Re-

formed, with Russia, and the Greek church, will outnumber her in Europe, and she has no National church in her communion any where else.

L. But there are some of her communion in most countries.

G. Not so many as of the Jews, who by this are more universal than your church, and so more Catholic. And none of the scattered seminaries of Rome in other Christian churches can be said to represent those churches in a general council, more than two or three titular popish bishops in England could represent the church of England as it now stands. But, on the contrary, their living in a separate communion in other christian churches, shews those churches not to be of their communion; and therefore cannot be represented in any of their councils. And these calling themselves oecumenical, as the Roman empire did, shews only how little criticisms upon words will avail against plain matter of fact; which I have shewed to be the case as to those texts urged for the supremacy of St. Peter. And that if words would do it, there are more, nay, and facts too, for the Universal Supremacy of St. Paul, at least over all the Christian churches of the Gentiles, which are all now in the world.

L. But there must be an infallibility some where in the church, and if it be neither in pope nor council, or that as you say, there never was, nor well can be a general council, truly so called, that is, of all the churches in the world, where do you place the infallibility?

G. No where, my lord, nor can it be among men who are all fallible.

L. We trust not in men, as men, but assisted by the infallible spirit of God. And this he has promised shall never depart from his church, as he has said, Isa. lix. 21. “My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seeds seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.” And he has said, “that the Priests’ lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts.” Mal. ii. 7.

G. Read the next words, “but ye are departed out of the way: ye have caused many to stumble at the law: ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord.” The first is what they should or ought to have done, the second is what they did do, which was quite contrary.

And notwithstanding the promise made in the first text you quoted, yet “they were all gone out of the way, they were together become abominable, there was none that did good, no not one:—that all the world might become guilty before God,” as well the church as the rest of the world. Rom. iii. 12, 19. And of the church it is said, “the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint: from the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds and bruises, and putrifying sores.” Isa. i. 5, 6. And God says, “mine heritage is unto me as a

lion in the forest, it crieth out against me, therefore have I hated it; mine heritage is unto me as a speckled bird," &c. Jer. xii. 8, 9.

And we have now long since seen that church of the Jews, to whom these promises were made, quite thrown off, and the church of the Gentiles come in its place.

L. These promises were ultimately intended to the Christian church.

G. But they were first given to the Jewish church, and belong even literally to her, and much more incontestably than to the church of Rome, to whom no promise whatsoever was made: nor has she any other pretence to the promises made to the church in general, than her supposed supremacy over all other Christian churches; which is disputed with her, and denied by the other churches. But there was none to dispute it with the Jewish church, for she was then the only visible church of God upon earth. And if the promises made to her, can fail, in vain does the church of Rome, or even the whole Gentile church claim these promises as indefeasible and unalterable to her: for if the promises made to the whole church of God upon earth can fail at one time, they may likewise at another, and there can be no certainty.

L. Can the promises of God then fail?

G. No, that is impossible, but we may mistake his promises, and not understand them aright. And we may not perform the conditions required.

L. But the promises made to the church (that particularly which I have named of Isa. lix. 21.) are positive and unconditional.

G. But there is still a condition implied, that is, of our obedience; which our Saviour has fully exemplified in the parable of the husbandmen who did not render the fruits of the vineyard. As treason forfeits an estate or honours given by a Prince, though in never so positive terms, and without any condition expressed, but that of allegiance to the Prince is always implied. And thus the church may forfeit her charter. God said to Eli, the high-priest of the Jewish church, "I said indeed that thy house, and the house of thy Father should walk before me for ever; but now the Lord saith, be it far from me; for them that honour me, I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." 1 Sam. ii. 30. And he said, Num. xiv. 34. "Ye shall know my breach of promise," or as our margin reads it, "the altering of my purpose." And he has told us plainly that we are thus to understand his promises as well as threatenings, Jer. xviii. 7, &c. "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation (or a church) to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation (or church) to build and to plant it, if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then will I repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them."

This was the language of the prophets to the Jewish church. But she understood it not, and leant upon the promises made to her as unconditional and indefeasible, let her be as wicked as she would. And

this hardened her against her prophets, whom she persecuted for this reason as enemies to the church, as you find, Jer. xviii. 18. “Come and let us devise devices against Jeremiah, for the law shall not perish from the priest.” Here the Jewish church stuck, and here the church of Rome sticks at this day.

L. But the Gentile church cannot fail like the Jewish, for then there would be no church at all.

G. The Apostle of the Gentiles says to the Gentile church, “thou also shalt be cut off, if thou continue not in the goodness of God.” And that the Jews,” if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graff them in again.” Rom. xi. 22, 23. This shews that all the promises made either to the Jewish or the Gentile church are conditional, *viz.* “If they continue in the goodness of God: otherwise,” says St. Paul to the Gentile church, “thou also shalt be cut off,” and of all the Gentile churches this was said more particularly to the church of Rome, for this is in the Epistle wrote to her, and to her it was said, “thou also shalt be cut off.”

And of the church in general, whether Jewish or Gentile, it is said, Luke, xviii. 8. “When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith upon the earth?” Where will then that visibility be, which Rome boasts of as an essential mark of the true church?

L. The church is compared to a city set upon a hill, to a candle giving light to all that are in the house. This is to shew her visibility.

G. She is likewise compared to a woman persecuted into a wilderness, Rev. xii. 6. to a lodge in a gar-

den of cucumbers, to a besieged city. Isa. i. 8. And lastly, that she will be so little visible, as that faith shall hardly be found upon the earth. This is not to be reconciled but of different states of the church, and at different times.

L. Christ says, Eph. v. 27. that “his church is glorious, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish.” And he calls her his beloved.

G. So God called the church of the Jews, Jer. xii. 7. “The dearly beloved of his soul.” Yet says, he had forsaken her for her wickedness, and hated her. And Isaiah represents her as most filthy and corrupted, chap. i. 4, 5, 6.

The church is called holy and beloved because of God’s covenant with her to be his holy and beloved, which will be hereafter in those that are perfected; when the tares and the wheat shall be separated, but they must grow together till then, when “Christ shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity.” Mat. xiii. 41. Then, and not till then, will the church be all “glorious, without spot or wrinkle,” &c. As the text says, Eph. v. 25. “Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it—that he might present it to himself, a glorious church not having spot or wrinkle,” &c. But he has not yet so presented it. That time is not come. She is still in her cleansing state, but not yet thoroughly cleansed. And the scripture speaks of both these states of the church, but when we distinguish not, and would apply to the

most corrupt state what is said of the most glorious, we must needs fall into many errors and mistakes.

This is the difficulty under which the church of Rome now labours, she first making herself the Catholic church: and then applying to herself, in this her corrupt state, whatever is said of the church even in her perfect, glorious, and triumphant state; creates her infinite trouble, and endless distinctions, to reconcile these; which is as impossible to be done as to make the state of the church in heaven and upon the earth to be the same: and while the corruptions in the church of Rome are confessed and lamented by the most learned and most pious in her own communion.

And she may as well maintain her impeccability as her infallibility; for sin is the greatest error: and therefore I think nothing can be infallible, but what is likewise impeccable.

L. The Apostles were infallible, but not impeccable.

G. As much the one as the other. St. Peter erred, and “walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel. And many were carried away with his dissimulation.” Gal. ii. 13, 14. And St. Paul owned that in some cases he “had no commandment of the Lord,” only “gave his judgment,” as a private person, and “spoke by permission, and not of commandment.” But in other cases he says, “I command, yet not I, but the Lord—and to the rest speak I, not the Lord.” And it is so, “after my judgment; and I think also that I have the spirit of God,”

1. Cor. vii. 6, 10, 12, 25, 40. And no doubt great deference was paid to his judgment, as being an inspired person, but not infallible in every thing, as he himself said. The Apostles were enabled to work many and great miracles, which gave them full credence as to what they delivered for christian doctrine. But this was no personal nor universal infallibility.

L. The church of Rome has her miracles too.

G. What! Both true and false? Can both come from God?

L. I know you deny our miracles.

G. And you cannot deny the many false miracles which have been notoriously detected in the church of Rome. But if one sham miracle had been found in the Apostles, I am afraid it had discredited all the others, and called their mission in question whether it was from God or not. The Devil has power (when permitted) to “ shew great signs and wonders,” as we are told, Mat. xxiv. 24. 2. Thess. ii. 9. and the reason is given, verse 12, *viz.* as a just punishment to unrighteousness. But one false or pretended miracle is sufficient to disprove all that comes from the same hand. Therefore your books of miracles, the legends, must either all be believed, or all rejected, all coming from the same authority; and the greatest part of them are so very gross and simple, that no man of sense among you will say, that he can believe half of them. And your learned call them *piæ fraudes*, *holy cheats*, to stir up the devotion of the vulgar, who swallow all implicitly! And your lordship will have difficulty enough to believe all the miracles alleged of their

reliques. And, as I said, you must take all, or none ; unless you think that God can work true miracles, and the Devil false ones, by the same means, and at the same time ! Can you believe the quantities that have been shewn of the Virgin Mary's milk at several times and places ? And so of the wood of the cross that is shewed in many places ? Is it the same head or body of the same saint, that is shewn at different churches, each of which contend that they have the true one ? And each have miracles to vouch the truth of their relique ! You may see a large collection of these, and the monstrousness of the legends out of which they are taken, in a book intituled, *The Devotions of the Roman Church* ; which will prevent my giving instances in all the points before mentioned.

Upon the whole, this pretence of miracles, the legends, and shops of reliques, which are bought and sold, instead of a proof, are the greatest prejudice to men of sense against your church.

And it is the sorest blow that christianity has received, while the common people put these legends upon the level with the holy Scriptures, as having both the same foundation, that is, the authority of your church. Whence atheists and deists take a handle to render both alike fabulous.

L. But after all, we believe the Scriptures upon the authority of the church.

G. This is the old circle out of which you can never conjure yourselves. You believe the Scriptures, because the church bids you ; and you believe the

church because the Scriptures bid you. This is running round, and proving a thing by itself.

L. No. For we establish the authority of the church in the first place, thus we think it inconsistent with the goodness of God not to give men an infallible guide to lead them in the right way to heaven, since our own reason is so weak that we cannot trust to it : and that guide is the church.

G. How do you know that ? What have you but your own reason to tell you so ? And if you cannot trust your reason, you cannot believe the church. So that all bottoms upon your own reason still, from which you strive in vain to escape.

L. But the Scriptures bid us believe the church.

G. This is running into your circle again, to believe the church for the Scriptures, and the Scriptures for the church. But I will bring you out of it. For pray tell me, why do you believe a God ? It would be blasphemy to say, you believe it upon any authority, for that would place such an authority above God. And it would be nonsense to say you believe it either from the church, or the Scriptures ; because you can believe neither, without first believing there is a God. What is it then ? We believe a God purely upon our own reason. And we cannot be more sure that there is a God, than we are persuaded of the truth of those reasons upon which we do believe it. And if God has given us no other guide but our own reason, with the assistance of his grace, to believe in himself ; if this be all we have, or can have, for the first and main article of our creed, what further do we require for

those of less consequence? And that we cannot have more assurance than this, we may perceive by this experiment, *viz.* Whether we believe most firmly and with greatest assurance, what we have only from our own reason, or what we receive upon the authority of the church? For example, are you not more undoubtedly assured of the being of a God which you believe purely upon your own reason, than of transubstantiation, purgatory, or whatever you believe upon the authority of your church?

And to say, that God is obliged to give every man an outward infallible guide, is making too bold with providence, and measuring his infinite wisdom and goodness by our short line. He has made creatures as it has pleased him. Some incapable of happiness or misery, as the inanimates; some capable only of pleasures or pain of sense, as animals; and he has endowed others with reason, as man, and “left him in the hand of his own counsel, set good and evil, life and death before him,” and free-will to chuse which liketh him, Deut. xi. 26. xx. 15. Ecclus. xv. 14, &c. Again of rational creatures, some he has fixed in happiness, as the blessed of heaven; others are vessels of wrath, as the angels that fell: but man is betwixt these two, to work out his own salvation by his obedience to the will of God, who will judge every man according to what he has given him. “For as many as have sinned without the law, shall be judged without the law, as they that have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law. For there is no respect of persons with God,” Rom. ii. 11, 12. But according to your

argument there is great respect of persons with him, and his goodness has failed the far greatest part of mankind from the beginning of the world; for what outward guide is there to Jews, Heathens, Mahometans, and Christians; and to the many subdivisions among all these? And all these have guides of their own, and the blind lead the blind with most of them. For it is fact that the generality of mankind do not chuse for themselves, but take their religion upon trust as they are educated. And we must leave all this to God; who will require from none more than he has given; for “the Lord is good to all: and his tender mercies are over all his works,” Psal. cxlv. 9.

L. Can any be saved then but by Christ?

G. No. But many may be saved by him who never heard of him. He died to make satisfaction to the infinite justice for the sins of the whole world; and took our nature upon him, to atone for our fallen nature, to be applied to such who perform the conditions required. He will judge the Gentiles by the law of morality, which he has planted in their hearts, and we call natural religion: but from christians he requires faith in Christ, joined with sincere repentance.

L. Then the Gentiles are in better condition than we, because less is required of them.

G. Is it no advantage then to have the glory of God revealed to us, “in the face of Jesus Christ?” As the apostle speaks, 2 Cor. iv. 6. And the effect of it upon us is described, chap. 3. ver. 18. *viz.* “That we all with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory”

of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord." The sight of the wonderful economy of our redemption must needs fill our souls with rapture and joy, when we behold the glory of God in all his attributes, each exalting the other to the uttermost, as it is said, Jam. ii. 13, "*miseriordia super-exaltat judicium*," that the mercy of God exalts his justice; for justice requires full satisfaction, it cannot remit a farthing: to remit is mercy and not justice; and God is justice itself, justice in the abstract. Here then infinite wisdom finds out a full satisfaction to infinite justice: and infinite goodness affords that satisfaction, by the incarnation, perfect obedience, meritorious passion, and glorious resurrection, &c. of the only begotten Son of God! This enflames our devotion, invigorates our obedience, and gives compunction to our repentance, when we "have sinned and come short of the glory of God," Rom. iii. 23. God has vouchsafed to make a covenant with us in Christ, by virtue of which we may appeal to his justice and veracity. It is a pardon signed and sealed by the king, which we may plead in court. The heathen have not this, but they are still under his mercy, they may say, God is merciful to forgive us; but we may say with St. John, that God is "faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness," 1. John i. 9. This is a great, a very great advantage we have above the Gentiles. And may not we enjoy it with thankfulness, and not damn them all to the pit of hell? Because God has made a

covenant with us, may we not leave them to his uncovenanted mercy? Is our eye evil to them, because he has been good to us? Or would we limit his mercies to his creatures, with whom we have nothing to do? "For what have we to do to judge them that are without?—Them that are without, God judgeth," 1. Cor. v, 12. And God did judge one who was without, that is, out of the pale of the church, to be the most beloved of God, and that "there was none like him in the earth," Job i. 8. And he is put upon the level with the greatest in the church, "though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it," &c, Ezek. xiv. 14. And as God chose a Gentile to be the great example of patience to all ages, Jam. v. 11. And of another Gentile it was said by Christ, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel," Luk. vii. 9. And he who said often to his disciples, "O ye of little faith!" and upbraided his apostles with their unbelief, Mark xvi. 14. yet said to a woman of Canaan, (who would not be discouraged for the objection he put against her, of her not being within the pale of the church, but without among the dogs) "O woman, great is thy faith." Matth. xv. 26. And of the ten healed there was but one thankful, "and he was a Samaritan," Luke, xvii. 16. that is, a schismatic, a stranger, as Christ here calls him, ver. 18, and said to him, "thy faith hath made thee whole." And the pattern of charity is placed in the person of a Samaritan, in opposition to both a priest and a Levite, Luke, x. 30. &c. Which makes good what St. Peter said of Cornelius a Gentile, Acts, x. 34

“ Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons : but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.” This is the doctrine which Christ taught, Luke, iv. 25, &c. When he minded the Jews, that a widow of Sarepta, a city of Sidon, and Naaman the Syrian were preferred to all the widows and lepers in Israel. Which so enraged the Jews, tenacious of the privilege of the church, that they “ thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill (whereon their city was built) that they might cast him down headlong.” And it is said, that they were “ filled with wrath.” The like fury they shewed when St. Paul told them that the Gospel was to be extended beyond the pale of their church, and that God had sent him to the Gentiles. “ And they gave him audience unto that word, and then lift up their voices, and said, away with such a fellow from the earth ; for it is not fit that he should live. And they cried out, and cast off their cloathes, and threw dust into the air,” Acts, xxii. 22. And the like rage is seen among the zealous of your church, when they hear of the Gospel being extended out of the pale of their communion ; though with Christians who hold the three ancient creeds, and have every thing essential to a church, except what Rome has made so, *viz.* the universal and unlimited sovereignty of her bishop. Which is the great bone of contention, wherein Rome stands single by herself, thrusting all other Christian churches from her ; like a man in a boat who thinks he thrusts the shore from him, whereas he only thrusts himself.

from the shore ; as Firmilian said to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, *Excidisti te ipsum, noli te fallere,—*“ Do not deceive yourself, you have cut yourself off from the church ; for he is truly a schismatic who has made himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity ; for while you think you can excommunicate all other churches from you, you have only excommunicated yourself from them.” *Dum enim putas omnes à te abstineri posse. te ipsum abstinuisti.* Cyprian, Ep. 75. p. 228. Edit. Oxon.

But the church of the Jews had a much stronger plea for her universal supremacy and infallibility, because all proselytes, of whatever nations, must come in to her, for there was no other visible church of God upon earth ; and the sacrifices were limited to the Temple at Jerusalem. Accordingly we find, Acts, viii. 27. that the Eunuch came out of Ethiopia to Jerusalem for to worship.

Now if the Christian sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, the most solemn worship of God, were confined to St. Peter's church at Rome, and could be had no where else ; as the most solemn worship of God ; the legal sacrifices, which were types of the Christian, were confined to the Temple at Jerusalem : and if the church of Rome, like that of the Jews, were the only church in the world ; yet after all, would the church of Rome have no more pretence to infallibility and perpetuity than the church of the Jews had. And as the church of the Jews has been cut off, for her disobedience to the law of God : so (as before-mentioned) has it been said to the

Church of Rome particularly, "Thou also shalt be cut off," that is, upon the same condition, "if thou continue not in the goodness of God," Rom. xi. 22. And we cannot imagine there should be a church of Rome visibly as now, with a Pope at the head of it, and a number of bishops, cardinals, &c. under him, holding the true Christian faith when that time comes which our Saviour has foretold, Luke, xviii. 8. "When the son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" For then it would be found, and very visibly at Rome.

But that state of the church is better represented by the 7000 who had not bowed to Baal, but of whom Elijah knew none, but thought he was "left alone," Rom. xi. 3, 4. This was a state of segregation; there were particular persons who kept the faith, but invisible to the world or to one another; without any public worship or so much as private meetings, for Elijah would surely have known of these, and been the principal among them: far less could they have had an organized church with pastors and rulers over them, without being known to Elijah and to many more, even to their persecutors; who found out the most private recesses of the primitive Christians, and their meetings, though in the most secret manner, for divine worship; and their bishops too, whom they seized and hauled to prisons and to martyrdom, for they could not lie hid, and the faith was then visible though under persecution. Therefore it must be a much more universal depravity and corruption of the church of which our Saviour spoke, when faith should not be found, at least visibly, upon the earth.

It will be more like the state of the church before the flood, presented by the ark, "wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved," 1 Pet. ii. 20. And as the corruption of the old world was great, we may suppose the corruption to be greater before the second coming of Christ, as the destruction by fire is more terrible than that by water. However such an universal corruption is here foretold, as will in no ways consist with the least sort of that visibility which the church of Rome requires as a mark of the true church, and to continue with her for ever.

But on the other hand, if there shall be a visible church in those days, then that church, at least the generality, which is the visibility of it, will fall from the faith, else it would be visibly to be found upon the earth; and then men will be misled by the church, and by those marks of visibility, &c. which the church of Rome gives her; in like manner as they were misled by the church before, when she commanded them to reject their Messiah. He came first unto "his own," the church of the Jews, the only visible church then upon the earth, but she "received him not," John i. 11. for she was corrupt and blinded, under the mask of Pharisaical sanctity, and strict observance of the law, even to the "tything of mint, annise, and cummin;" she was zealous in the outward observances, but neglected "the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith," Matth. xxiii. 23. And so it may be at the second coming of Christ, as it was at the first; for there is no more promise of

infallibility to the one state of the church, than to the other.

L. But it was prophesied in the Old Testament, that the Jews should reject their Messiah at his first coming.

G. And in the New Testament, that at his second coming "he should not find faith upon the earth."

But the Jews did not so understand these prophecies against themselves. They said that the church was the only interpreter of Scripture, and they must take the law from the mouth of their priests: and the church did interpret these Scriptures otherwise than Christ did.

L. But Christ being come, he was then the church.

G. He was not the church, for he came to redeem the church. He did not come to redeem himself. He was the head, the church, the body; but the head is not the body.

Besides it is perfectly begging the question of the Jews, to suppose that Christ was the Messiah, for that they deny, and bid us prove it. That is the whole question betwixt them and us.

L. His heavenly doctrine, his miracles, and the prophecies of him, prove him to be the Messiah.

G. The Jews answer all this by the authority of the church, which said, "have any of the rulers, or of the Pharisees believed on him? But this people who knoweth not the law, are cursed." John, vii. 48, 49. And to rivet this curse, they excommunicated those who did confess Christ, chap. ix. 22, 34, xvi. 2. And

they said, that Christ wrought his miracles by Beelzebub, Matth. ix. 34, xii. 24. And who was to be judge in this case, the people or the church? Upon the foot of the authority of the church, it was impossible at that time for any to be a Christian. Therefore of all men, Christians have the least reason to insist upon this.

L. Then I find you resolve all upon private judgment.

G. It is all we have for the belief of a God, or of Christ, and, by your own confession, for the choice of a church. And then we may well trust to it in smaller matters. In short, we must trust to it in every thing without exception: for it is as impossible to believe any thing without our understanding, as to see without our eyes.

L. But you believe some mysteries which you pretend not to understand or explain, as the doctrine of the holy Trinity, the Incarnation, &c.

G. My reason tells me, that there must be many things in the nature of God which I cannot understand or explain, because he is infinite and incomprehensible. And these I take purely upon the revelation that is given of them in the holy Scriptures, for my own reason could never have found them out, nor can perfectly understand them. They are dark to me; like a country I never saw, I cannot have a right idea of it till I come thither; as I cannot of heaven, or of the state of separate souls. Yet I cannot help framing some conception to myself, or what I know

“ never entered into the heart of man to conceive,” that is, aright, and according to these things are. Therefore I take not upon me to explain them, for that would be to involve myself, and I know that I must greatly err. And yet it would be as much against reason to deny these things, as to deny there was any country in the world, or star in the firmament, which I had not seen. And much more unreasonable, it would be, to think there was nothing in the nature in the infinite being which I did not comprehend : or because that cannot be expressed to us, but in words adapted to our understanding, therefore to measure his nature by ours ; and because Peter, James, and John are three men, therefore to think that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost must be three Gods. But when I say three persons, with relation to the divine Trinity, there comes not such a thought in my head as three persons of men ; but because personal actions are attributed to each of the divine three, therefore we call them persons, which word the Scripture applies to God. Heb. i. 3. But it is only *ad captum*, as the schools speak, that is, condescending our capacity, as when God is said to repent, to grieve, &c. it is not that we should think it really so, for that would be contradictory to the nature of God ; but it conveys a notion to us, that we should act as if it were so, that God were angry or grieved at our sins, and would repent of the blessings he had given or promised to us, if we took not heed to walk in his ways which he has set before us.

L. I am afraid the Deists will think this a straining the point in favour of revelation, and say that they are much easier without it.

G. They will not find it so, when they consider that they are in no less difficulties upon following their own reason only; for example, they allow a first cause and creator of all things, because nothing can make itself: and that first cause must have a necessary being, and consequently from all eternity; and that eternity is a duration without succession or time, or having any beginning, wherein all is present, without either past or to come. This the Deist is forced to confess upon the conviction of his reason: but, he will not pretend to have so much as any idea or conception what this eternity is or can be, nor can he imagine a duration without beginning, in which there is nothing past, nor any thing to come. Nor can he express this any otherwise than in words of time, which he must own are not at all proper or applicable to it; the very word beginning is inconsistent with eternity, and to say before the beginning, is a contradiction. Here then he is lost, and must have recourse to the same excuse which he ridicules in revelation, *viz.* that we cannot speak properly of God, nor in other words than what belong to men, and therefore that these words are not to be taken strictly, nor argued upon, or consequences drawn from them, for that this would involve us in numberless contradictions. And there is not one objection which the Deist or Socinian makes against the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, &c. but are of this sort, by arguing from the

nature of man to the nature of God, from the persons of the one, to the persons of the other, &c. Which these men of reason think highly unreasonable in their own case, as to argue from time to eternity, &c.

L. But, Sir, the Deist would ask you, upon what authority you believe that Revelation, viz. of the Scriptures? And since you will not have it built upon the authority of the church, I see not what other authority you can allege for it.

G. Nor I neither, for I put it upon no authority. It is evidence, and not authority, upon which my belief of the Scriptures is founded.

L. Then you believe upon the authority of evidence.

G. That expression is not proper, though sometimes carelessly used; for authority and evidence are two things: if I believe a thing for your telling me so, without any other reason, then I believe it purely upon your authority; but if a man I never saw before makes a thing very evident to me, and convinces my reason, I believe not then upon his authority, for he has none with me, but upon the evidence he has given me. And what that evidence is upon which we believe the Holy Scriptures, is set forth in a little book I had the honour to present to your lordship, intitled, *The Truth of Christianity demonstrated*, &c. which was wrote to convince Deists, who believe no church, or any church authority. And if you have no other evidence but the authority of your church to prove the truth of the Scriptures, I see not how you will ever convince a Deist, who denies both.

But if I tell him that I believe the Scriptures, and the facts therein related, upon the same, and much stronger evidence than I have for believing there was such a man as Alexander or Cæsar, that there is such a town as Rome or Constantinople, though I was never there: yet I believe it, not upon the authority, far less the infallibility of any man or number of men, that tell me so; but from the nature of the evidence which makes it impossible for mankind to concert such a lie, or to carry it on, without being detected. And if the truth of Christianity, that is, of the Scriptures, can be demonstrated as plainly as these other facts, (which I think is done in the book I mentioned) then a Deist must either be convinced or confounded.

Now if you will let your church come in as part of the evidence of christianity, she will not be refused, so far as her share goes: but upon her authority, and upon hers alone, the truth of the Scriptures, and of christianity, will be a jest to the Deists; since her authority can be proved no otherwise than by the Scriptures, and then back again, the Scriptures by her authority!

L. But several parts of the Scriptures have been disputed, as you reject those books you call apocryphal out of the canon of the Old Testament: and the ancient heretics forged false Gospels and false Epistles in the names of the Apostles: and as the canon of the New Testament now stands, some of the Epistles have been disputed by some learned men. And this

could not be determined, nor the canon established, but by the authority of the church.

G. As to the apocryphal books, we received the canon of the Old Testament from the church of the Jews, which never admitted them into the canon of their Scriptures. And how should we know their canon better than themselves?

Again, we are sure they were not in the christian canon in the days of St. Jerome, if he knew what was received by the church as the canon of Scripture, for in his *Prologus Galeatus*, printed before your own Vulgar Latin, he rejects them as apocryphal, and says they were not in the canon of the holy Scriptures.*

But as to these books themselves, let any one but read the conclusion of them, in excuse for the weakness of the performance, and then think it possible, if he can, that the Holy Ghost should make such a speech as this—"If I have done well—it is what I desired, but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto.†" Or as your Vulgar has it, *Si quidem bene, et ut historiæ competit, hoc et ipse velim: si autem minus digne, concedendum est mihi.* That is, "I ask your pardon, if I have not done my work as it ought to be."

But as to a full examination of the apocryphal books, and their authority, I refer your lordship to Dr. Cosin his *Scholastical History of the Canon of*

* Inter apocrypha esse ponenda——Non sunt in canone.

† 2. Machab. xv. 38.

the Holy Scripture, printed 1657, and not yet answered that I can hear of.

L. But the canon of the New Testament was established upon the authority of the church.

G. No, my lord, not at all by her authority, but plainly by evidence: they proceeded wholly upon evidence, *viz.* whether such an Epistle was sent to such a church, as to the church of Corinth, Ephesus, Galatia, &c. who carefully kept the originals, and sent copies to other churches, as was commanded, Col. iv. 16. And by this communication of the churches one with another, the true Scriptures were known, and it is commonly set down at the end of the Epistles by what hand they were sent. And by this method the spurious Epistles and Gospels forged by heretics, were at first detected, as you will find in the last chapter of the fifth book of Eusebius his Ecclesiastical History, where it is told, that the heretics were brought to this test, and could not produce the originals whence they took their copies: and that their copies did vary from one another, every one adding what opinion came into his own head: and that they could not tell from whom they had learned such new doctrines. Thus the canon of the New Testament was settled in those ages when these evidences were fresh and notorious: and has been received since that time by all the christian churches in the world, so unanimously, that there is no dispute betwixt any churches concerning the canon of the New Testament. And this is an evidence too strong for the caprice of some particular men who would shew their wit in making objections

against this or that part. But this cannot hurt the faith, because the whole faith is over and over again fully expressed and contained in those Gospels and Epistles, which are acknowledged by all.

L. But there are various lections and translations of the Scriptures into many languages, which agree not exactly, and in every point, with one another. And how shall we examine this by evidence? What evidence is there in this case? Here the authority of the church must come in to determine between these various lections and translations. And these various lections or different readings of several texts are very many, which some learned men have taken pains to collect.

G. But there is no difference among them in any thing material or what concerns the faith. So that this, instead of an objection (which the Deists make use of to invalidate the truth of the Scriptures and the certainty of our faith) proves a stronger confirmation of both, in that among so many various readings and translations no material difference is found; or other than may, and without a miracle must happen in so many thousand copies and impressions as have been made of the Scriptures. And none I suppose will pretend that every writer or printer is infallible, not to mistake a letter or a word, or misplace them. But that nothing of this sort has happened to the detriment of the faith, or making disputes in any thing that is material, must be attributed to a very particular providence.

And the church of Rome has not undertaken, nor

was it worth her while, to attempt the adjusting of the various readings : for in that translation which she has most approved, the Vulgar Latin, some of the various lections are given on the margin of her own editions.

But what signifies the Latin which is not the vulgar language of any nation now in the world : I say, what does this signify to the people who understand it not ?

L. Therefore to answer your objections of our locking up the Scriptures from the people, we have them now translated into the vulgar tongues of each country, particularly in France, where they are publicly sold in the shops.

G. This instead of an answer to the objection, is a confessing to it, and owning it to have been just and necessary. And thus much your people have gained by our Reformation.

But alas, my lord, what have they gained ? There is something worse than even a total locking up the Scriptures in these translations, that is, a corrupting the text to deceive the people, different from even your own Vulgar Latin translation, which you have authorized. This is made apparent in the collection, printed here at London, of the many texts thus evidently abused, both by adding to them and taking from them, and misinterpreting them ; in the French New Testament printed in France for the use of the new converts there. And this has occasioned the suppression of that New Testament, insomuch that few

of them are to be found, at least they are not publicly sold now at Paris.

L. If they are suppressed, then your complaints are answered. But have you any objection against the Louvain translation now printed and sold at Paris, with the approbation of the doctors and divines there?

G. Yes, my lord, here is one in my hand, bought in Rue St. Jaques in Paris, where they are printed, with the approbations before them, in the year 1701. And in this translation there are many mistranslations. I will shew your lordship one; it is said, Acts, xiii. 2. "As they ministered to the Lord." The vulgar Latin has it in the same words, *ministrantibus illis Domino*. But this French translation is in these words, *or comme ils offroient au Seigneur le sacrifice de la Messe*. "When they had offered to the Lord the sacrifice of the mass."

L. I suppose they took that to be the meaning of the words.

G. Your lordship may suppose so. But, my lord, what the import of the words is, or what consequences may be drawn from them, is what we call exposition or commenting upon the text; but to alter the words of the text is of another nature, it is false translation, and not an interpretation; and comes under that terrible curse pronounced Rev. xxii. 18, 19. against those who add to, detract from, or pervert the words of Holy Scripture.

And to shew that this was not done by chance, and

what use they intended to make of this text thus translated, Acts, xiii. 2. they put upon the margin, *La Sainte Messe*, “ the Holy Mass.” That the people might here find a plain text of Scripture for the Mass and the sacrifice of it. And in the Index (which is done by the same authority as the translation) upon the word *Messe*, this text is named as a proof that the apostles did celebrate mass.

This sacrifice of the Mass is a plain addition to the text. Let me give one instance of subtracting from it. It is said, Heb. xi. 21, “ that Jacob worshipped *ἐπὶ* upon or leaning upon the top of his staff.” But this French translation leaves out the word *ἐπὶ upon*, and renders it that he “ worshipped the top of his staff.” *Adora le haut de son baton*. And in the Index at the word *adoration* this text is quoted for the “ adoration of wood, *l'adoration fait aux bois*.” Heb. xi. 21. Belike they thought there was some image carved or painted on the top of Jacob's staff which he worshipped ! And so this is made a text for worshipping their wooden images and pictures ! especially the solemn worship of the cross every Good Friday. And who knows but that the head of Jacob's staff was not round but crutch-ways, set a-cross (as is usual with old men) and then the staff was a perfect cross !

In the former text concerning the mass this French translation adds to the words of their own Vulgar Latin as well as of the original : but in this last, the Vulgar Latin as well as the French substract from the original, and both render this text the same way.

But to do justice to all, the Port Royal Bible de-

livers this text from the gross interpretation put upon it, by means of a false translation, to favour the worshipping of wood.

In the other French translation I mentioned before, made for the use of the new converts, this expression 1 Cor. iii. 15. of some that shall be saved with great difficulty, as if “passing through the fire,” is boldly rendered, “the fire of purgatory,” as the words of the text, without any different character, as is used with us when a word is put in to make English of an Hebrew or Greek idiom. But in this Louvain translation the text is let stand, “so as by fire,” only *purgatoire* is put on the margin in this edition made since the objections against the other translation, in which the addition of purgatory to this text is particularly taken notice of.

I could give your lordship more of the corruptions of texts in the French translations. I have now only named three, one for the sacrifice of the mass, another for the adoration of the cross and of images, and one for purgatory.

L. The church is not answerable for these translations, however approved and recommended by doctors, universities, &c.

G. But the people are deceived by them. The people believe as they are taught. There is small security to them in the abstruse disputes concerning infallibility, how far it extends, and where it is placed, and in the disputes betwixt Popes and Councils about it. These are questions of which I suppose your lordship will easily grant the common people are

no judges. They know nothing of the matter. How should they, when the learned men are divided among themselves concerning them? So that this infallibility, if it could be found and fixed, would be of little use to the generality of the people, unless their curates and their fathers and mothers who instruct them, were likewise all of them infallible; for as I said, they believe as they are taught, and examine no further. Nay, they are forbid to examine, for that implies a doubt, and they are not to doubt of the religion they are taught, but to receive, without any doubt, what has been told them by their curates, fathers, mothers, or nurses, and what is current in the country where they live. This is all the infallibility of which they are capable. And this is the way of all the earth. It is thus that the generality of mankind, whether Heathens, Jews, Mahometans, or Christians, receive their religion. And without examining into what we have been taught, no man could change his religion. None could ever have become a Christian, especially no Jew, who had the authority of his church against Christ, to which church he alleges promises of perpetuity and infallibility.

L. The Bishop of Meaux has cleared this in his Conference with Mr. Cloud. Where the Bishop asserts the necessity of a *living infallible judge* always in being to direct men; and says, that when Christ was come, he was that living judge, and so the authority of the Jewish church was superseded.

G. This is *gratis dictum* and begging the question of the Jew, as I have said already, who upon the

authority of his church, denies our Christ to have been the Messiah. I will not repeat, only ask these few questions further. 1. Who was this living judge before the flood? for the Bishop says there must be always such an one in being. 2. Was Abraham, who was known only to a few neighbours, and wrought no miracles to convince others, was he, I say, given as such a guide or judge to the whole earth? And Christ was not so great a traveller as Abraham. 3. Where was this living judge when Christ was dead? And if there was none for three days, it might be so for three, or three hundred years, or for good and all, because the argument fails for the necessity of such a judge always in being. You will not say the church can fail for three days. The promises of God can never fail, no, not for a moment.

L. Christ founded his church before he died, and left his apostles for guides, chiefly Peter the prince and principle of unity to them all.

G. And yet of the apostles, one betrayed him, another forswore him (and that was Peter); all forsook him.

L. That was human frailty and personal. But they retained the true faith, they were in no error as to that.

G. The greatest that could be, "For as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead." John, xx. 9. "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain: ye are yet in your sins." 1 Cor. xv. 17. And the reason given for choosing Matthias into the room of Judas was, "That he

might be a witness with the other apostles of the resurrection of Christ." Acts, i. 22. And what faith could they have in him whom they had quite given over, and never expected to see him more? "They trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel." Luke, xxiv. 21. But when he was dead, all their hopes were gone, they expected no redemption from him. This was far from a Christian faith, and could there be a Christian church without this faith?

To avoid all this, and secure the promise of indefectibility, to the church, some of your authors of greatest name have said, that the church was then preserved in the Virgin Mary. And thence infer that the Catholic church may be preserved in one woman, as it was then, and that so it may be again, in the times of Anti-Christ, and the great defection is foretold will be before the "second coming of Christ, when faith shall not be found upon the earth," that is very hardly, when it may be confined to one laic, a woman, or a baptized infant, as others of your doctors allow.*

L. This is giving up the church quite, as a society, with government, discipline, &c. and I hardly believe any of our approved authors have said so much, and not been censured for it.

G. They are no less men than Alensis, the author of the Gloss upon the Decretals, Lyra, Occam, Alliaco, Panormitan, Turrecremata, Peter de Monte, St. Antoninus, Cusanus, Clemangis, Jacobatius, J. Fr. Picus, &c. And to save repetition, your lordship

* Bannes com. in 2. 2. Quest. In Art. 10. Dub. i.

will find their books and words quoted, in this small treatise in my hand, intituled, *The incurable Scepticism of the Church of Rome*, printed here 1688. p. 22, &c. I name this little tract, because it is short, and will give your lordship no great trouble, and proceeds upon the same argument I have undertaken with your lordship, instead of the particular points in dispute betwixt the church of Rome and us, as invocation of saints, purgatory, &c. to go at once to the bottom of the cause, and examine the ground and foundation of faith, as taught in the church of Rome; which is shewed, I think to a demonstration, to be wholly precarious and uncertain: and that there is no greater difference and confusion among any sort of men, upon any subject whatsoever, than there is among the divines of the church of Rome, concerning her rule of faith, and infallible judge of controversy. And every one of the different opinions about it, is in flat contradiction to all the others, so that if any one of them be true, all the rest must be false: and yet they all pretend to believe with divine faith, and think it necessary in this case, because it is the foundation of their faith.

Now if according to these learned doctors, the whole church failed upon our Saviour's death, then the gates of hell did prevail for a time. And if the Virgin Mary were excepted, that would not do much as to the standing of the church. But have they any revelation to ground divine faith upon, or upon what grounds do they believe that the Virgin Mary knew the Scriptures or the Resurrection of Christ, more than the Apostles,

and was not under the same despondency as they were? This seems to be that sword which Simeon told her, should "pierce through her own soul also," Luke, ii. 35.

L. To avoid all these things, some suppose that the Christian church was not formed till the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, when Peter converted about 3000, as told in the 2d of the Acts. And that it was of this Christ spoke when he told Peter that he would build his church upon him, and called him a rock, and that it was fulfilled at this time, when Peter was made the instrument of that first and great conversion, which was the foundation of all that followed.

G. If the Christian church was not formed, as some think, till after the Resurrection, because our redemption was not till then compleated: Or, as others think, till the Ascension, when Christ commissioned his apostles to "go and teach all nations," Matth. xxviii. 19; or till the descent of the Holy Ghost, when they were "endued with power from on high," Luke, xxiv. 49; yet any of these ways it will follow that there was no Christian church before the death of Christ. And then that the Jewish was the only true church while Christ lived in the world. For the Jewish church was to last till the Christian was formed, else there was no church at all after Christ came, till his Resurrection. And then it would follow that the only true church in the world did reject our Christ. And then there will be no choice left us, but either to acknowledge the fallibility

of the church, or to reject Christ from being the Messiah. But if the Christian church was formed upon the first appearance of Christ in the world, or upon his ordaining the Twelve Apostles, and sending them out to preach, or upon any other act done in his life ; then, as said before, the whole church failed upon his death. But if the church cannot fail, no not for a moment, because of the necessity of a living infallible judge always in being, the succession of the monarchy of the church ought to be hereditary, where the King never dies. For this scheme will not admit of an interregnum for months or years that may be spent in the election of a Pope ; in all which time the church has no head or monarch : much less when there are Popes and Anti-popes, which has occasioned twenty-six schisms in the church of Rome, some of them of long continuance. And who is judge in such a case ? Is every man left to his own private judgment ? And is it all one which of the contending Popes he adheres to, whether to the right or the wrong ? Or can the church have two or three opposite heads at the same time ?

L. Therefore in France, where I received my education, they place not the infallibility in the Pope, but in a general council.

G. I told your lordship before that there never was a council truly general. That there are disputes in your church concerning general councils, some receiving those, or parts of them which others reject. And who shall be judge in this case ?

But suppose you were agreed among yourselves con-

cerning your councils, and that they were infallible, yet they are not a living judge always in being; you have not had one since that of Trent, which began in the year 1545, and concluded in the year 1563; now 150 years ago: and there may not be another in twice that time, if ever. Where then is the “living judge always in being,” which the Bishop of Meaux and others think necessary?

L. General councils may in this sense be called living, and always in being, that their canons are always in being, and determine controversies to those who regard them. And if new heresies, or controversies, or schisms of popes arise, new councils may be called to determine them.

G. And ages may pass before that can be done; and the church may be corrupted in the mean time for want of such a living judge. As Europe is now situated it would be pretty difficult to have a general council. And it may be long enough before any Pope may be of opinion to call one, or hazard his supremacy upon it.

But, my lord, the canons of past councils are not living, nor can speak for themselves. There are volumes printed of the learned in your own communion giving contrary expositions of the canons. I will instance in one, the third canon of the fourth, commonly called the Great Council of Lateran, acknowledged to be a true general council by all of the church of Rome, established in most express and positive terms, the Pope's power of deposing princes, and absolving their subjects from their allegiance, not only if he please to

call them heretics themselves, but if they do not ~~ex-~~ tirpate all heretics out of their dominions. This is maintained in the literal sense by Bellarmin and the Italian doctors. On the other hand, the Gallican church, who have condemned the deposing doctrine, and yet own this council of Lateran, are put to hard shifts, and many distinctions to solve this; but it is impossible, for either that doctrine must be true, or this council has greatly erred.

L. But not in faith. This is no matter of faith.

G. But is it not matter of salvation, for which we shall be judged at the last day? St. Paul says, Rom. xiii. 2, "They that resist the (lawful) powers, shall receive to themselves damnation—wherefore (says he, ver. 5.) ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, (or fear of temporal punishment from these powers) but also for conscience sake," that is, towards God. And what are these guides of conscience who lead us wrong in this? In the description of the last judgment given by Christ, Matth. xxv. 31, to the end, men shall be judged chiefly for their practice. There is nothing mentioned there but what men have done. And have we no guide as to practice, while we raise such contentions about a guide in faith? Or is the church a guide in practice too? And is a general council the church? Then the church has led us into a damnable practice, unless the Pope has power to depose Princes at his pleasure, and that there is no sin in rebellion, and all the blood and desolation that follow it, if his Holiness so command!

L. But the church does not oblige us to profess or

subscribe the deposing doctrine, no, nor to believe it, so that you may be a good Roman Catholic, notwithstanding all this. Nay, you may oppose the deposing doctrine, as the clergy of France do.

G. And may I not be as good a Roman Catholic if I do believe it, and defend it, and practice it too? And have I not all the encouragement the church of Rome can give me, the frequent practice of the Popes themselves, and here the canon of a general council for it? And have any of the Popes ever yet renounced it?

L. But the doctors do not agree about the sense of that canon. You see France takes it in a quite contrary sense from the Pope and Italian doctors.

G. Then your lordship sees that canons are but a dead letter, and that there may be disputes about them. And where then is the living infallible judge always in being? You see the canons of former councils cannot be this judge. There must be another judge to determine what the true sense of them is. And who should that judge be but the Pope, the head of the church? I am sure if I were a Roman Catholic, I should be on that side. I could shew your lordship several other canons of councils that are in dispute among your own doctors; but that can be no wonder, when I have already shewed, they are in dispute about the council themselves. So that there is no certainty, what the judgment of your church is. Or rather it is certain that it is most erroneous, and in matters that concern our eternal salvation, as well as the peace of the world, that is, rebellion (among

other things) which is as witchcraft and idolatry. I have instanced in this sin, because I know your lordship to be tenacious of your loyalty.

And now, my lord, since the saving of our souls is the end for our being of any church, I leave your lordship to judge, whether the people are safest in the communion of Rome, or of the church of England, as to this point.

L. They are safe in the church of France, where the deposing doctrine is disowned.

G. My lord, our dispute is with the church of Rome. And if the church of France differs from the church of Rome, in matters whereon our salvation depends, they cannot be said to be one church, or to have the same guides to heaven.

But, my lord, the Pope's deposing power has extended itself even to France, of which you will find frequent instances in their histories. And even so late as the holy league against Hen. III, all the Popes in that time joined with the league against the King, and supported that rebellion by their authority. And the generality of the bishops and clergy of France, and their universities, took part with the league, and justified it by principle and in print, the book *de justa abdicatione Henrici III*. "Of the just abdication of Henry III, King of France," was then wrote upon the foot of the deposing power, not only of the Pope, but also of the people. And D'Avila in his history of these civil wars in France, tells us, a great and solemn procession was made by order from the Cardinal *Legate*, to implore God's assistance (for the success of

the league against the King) in which the prelates, priests, and monks of the several religious orders, walked all in their accustomed habits; but besides them, armed openly with corslets, guns, swords, paltans, and all kind of arms, offensive and defensive, making at once a double shew, both of devotion, and constancy of heart to defend themselves. Which ceremony, though to many it seemed indecent and ridiculous, yet was of great use to augment and confirm the courage of the common people! *

And the Cardinal Legate says in the Declaration he published to the leaguers, that “to acknowledge an heretic for their King, is the dream of a madman, which proceeds from nothing else but heretical contagion.” †

And the leaguers shew wherein they placed their confidence, and say, “they are the most holy fathers, (the Popes) and the most holy see that have sent us relief; and though many have been called to that supreme dignity (of the Popedom) since these last troubles, yet hath there not been one of them who hath changed his affection towards us: a most certain testimony that our cause is just.” ‡

And there had been six Popes during the league, viz. Gregory XIII. Sixtus V. Urban VII. Gregory XIV. Innocent IX. and Clement VIII. And they supported that rebellion, not only with their

* D'Avila. Hist. of the Civil Wars of France. English translation. Printed in the Savoy, 1678. Lib. xi. p. 459.

† Ibid. Lib. xiii. p. 578.

‡ Ibid. p. 598.

blessing it and the authors of it, and cursing the king and all the loyal subjects who adhered to him; but they sent more substantial relief, *viz.* 300,000 crowns for the service of the Cardinal of Bourbon,* whom they had chosen King, by the name of Charles the Tenth, against the next in blood, only because he was a Protestant; and 15,000 crowns a month to carry on that rebellion, with an army of 6000 foot, and 1200 horse to assist these holy leaguers. The Pope went heart and hand into this work, “ which he accounted excellently good (says D’Avila) and of wonderful glory and advancement to the apostolic see.”† And afterwards, when the success of the King’s arms had induced several of the clergy and others to come over to him, the Pope sent his monitory letters‡ to the prelates and Catholics, commanding them “ under pain of excommunication, and of being deprived of their dignities and benefices, and of being used as sectaries and heretics, that they should withdraw themselves from those places that yielded obedience to Henry of Bourbon (so he stiled the King) and from the union and fellowship of his faction.” And the authority of the Pope prevailed so far at last, that those Catholics who had joined with the King formed a conspiracy against him, upon his delay of changing his religion, wherein the Princes of the blood were most violent, and told him plainly to his face, that if he did not perform his promise (to turn Roman Catholic)

* D’Avila. Hist. Civ. Wars. Lib. xii. p. 493, 501, 503.

† Ib. Lib. xi. p. 431.

‡ Ib. Lib. xiii. p. 613.

they would desert him, and join with the league. See D'Avila, p. 611, 612; as likewise, 555, 601, and 605.

After his conversion, and being by that established upon the throne, they feared his power, and therefore the Pope (as now) made less noise with the deposing doctrine, which yet he would not disown, but keep it, *in petto*, till a more fitting opportunity. But yet it was not carried so covertly, but that, even in their sermons, wise and willing men might know their meaning.* Ravailac upon his examination, alleged the Lent sermons before his assassination of King Henry IV. as the ground and encouragement to that execrable fact. But after that magnanimous Prince had thus fallen a sacrifice to their restless furious zeal, and his son succeeded young and fenceless to the government, then they set up again the deposing doctrine on high, because then they durst do it. With which our King James does justly upbraid them, particularly his opponent the Cardinal of Perron, in the preface to his book quoted on the margin. For it was but five years after the murder of Henry IV. *viz.* anno 1615, that Cardinal Perron in the assembly of the three estates of France, and in the name of the first estate, that is of the clergy, did re-assert the power of the Pope to depose Kings, with this reason, that otherwise "there had not been any church for many ages past; and that indeed the church (he meant of Rome) was the very synagogue of Antichrist."

* See King James the First's "Defence of the Right of Kings," against Cardinal Perron, p. 4.

But to come to a fresh instance now on foot, the Père Juveny, a French Jesuit, has lately printed a book at Rome in defence of the Pope's power to depose Princes: and the unwillingness and shifts of the Jesuits at Paris to disown him in this, and to disclaim that doctrine fairly and above board, shews that it is not yet quite extinguished in France, but kept in the embers, as in the reign of Henry IV. For all who understand that order of the Jesuits, know full well that none of them dare print, especially upon such a subject, without the approbation of their superiors. However it is plain by this, that the deposing doctrine is still countenanced at Rome. And that France is not entirely free from the infection. And though the vigour of the present King has depressed it very much, we cannot say it is totally extinguished, or that there is no danger of a relapse, while the authority of the Pope is so revered as head of the Catholic church, and this council of Lateran is still owned as truly general and infallible. And the Bishops of France still take an oath of fidelity and obedience to the Pope.

L. But that oath is not inconsistent with their fidelity to their king.

G. Pray, my lord, let me ask you, is not an oath to be taken in the known and declared sense of the imposer, for whose security it is taken?

L. Yes surely, for otherwise all such oaths would be equivocal, and no security at all.

G. Then the question will be, what the Pope means by the regalia of St. Peter, and all the

rights, prerogatives, &c. of the apostolical chair, as he calls his own, to which these Bishops are sworn, *contra omnem hominem*, against every man or power in the world. For it is the Pope who imposes this oath, and it is taken for its security. And has he not sufficiently declared what he means by it? Take it in the words of the Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris, where they say, “ that by this decree (of the *Bulla in Cœna Domini*) the Popes declare themselves sovereign monarchs of the world.” And this is no more than is given them at their coronation, as you have it in the Roman Pontifical, where the triple crown is put upon the Pope’s head with these words, “ receive this diadem adorned with three crowns : and know yourself to be father of princes and kings ; governor of the world : and vicar upon earth of our Saviour Jesus Christ.*” And must not this governor of the world have power to dethrone all petty kings and princes that are under him ? else how can he govern the world ? And the Popes think that this their sovereign power of deposing princes is fully recognized to them in the foresaid canon of the council of Lateran. And no Pope has ever yet been brought to disown this power. So far from it, that the Pope who most of any other asserted this *Bulla in Cœna*, and set it up on high, causing it to be affixed and published, not only at the doors of the churches in Rome, but in the

* Accipe thyram tribus coronis ornatam : et scias te esse patrem principum et regum : rectorem orbis : in terra vicarium salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi.

Field of Flora, that all might take notice, as you find at the end of the bull. And who practised his deposing power (the last in England) upon Queen Elizabeth, absolving her subjects from their allegiance, and commanding all the Catholics in England to pay her no more obedience, nor taxes, &c. I say this same Pope has been picked out to be canonized for a saint, the very last summer, 1712, by the present Pope, with all the solemnity and requisites in the church of Rome for making a saint. And this present Pope, as well as his predecessors, does, every year, thunder out the excommunications of this *Bulla in Cœna*, by “bell, book, and candle,” which, like Drawcansir, cuts down friends and foes; for there never was a Roman Catholic King in England, or in any other kingdom, either before the Reformation or since, but is excommunicated by this bull, and by the 24th article, past the power even of the Pope to absolve him, unless he first abrogate and annul all the laws of his country which are contrary to the tenor of this bull. And this never yet was done, and I dare say never will be done, in any Popish country in Europe, and there is not, nor ever was any Popish country in any other part of the world, unless you will except the late Spanish plantations in America. And not only the kings themselves, but all their parliaments, councillors, judges, officers, even to printers or publishers, or any whosoever that “either directly or indirectly, tacitly or expressly, violate, depress, or restrain the ecclesiastical liberties or rights of the apostolic see and holy church of Rome, howsoever

and whensoever obtained, or to be obtained," are all here together excommunicated, as likewise all archbishops, bishops, and clergy, who shall do the same, and all who shall presume to attempt any opposition or contravention to anything contained in this bull, are left under the "displeasure of Almighty God, and of his blessed apostles, Peter and Paul," which is the concluding sanction of this bull. And here saints must be joined with God, lest his displeasure should not be sufficient. By all this it appears, that there is hardly any Roman Catholic in the world above the condition of a ploughman, who is not excommunicated by this bull. And here you see plainly the Pope assuming a temporal or civil power over all emperors, kings, and princes, limiting them, by article 5, as to the raising taxes upon their own subjects, without his express license; and exempting all ecclesiastics from being any way taxed by them. Article 18. Or being under their power, even in civil or criminal causes, as by article 19, though it were treason, murder, &c. for which noble principle Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, was canonized, for maintaining the liberties of holy church!

Now, my lord, I leave it to yourself, whether if you were a king, you would desire all the bishops of your kingdom to be under an oath of fidelity to another, who pretended an absolute and civil power over you, with authority to depose you, as he had done to several of your predecessors, and would by no means be brought to disclaim such his power, but on the contrary, made a fresh claim of it every year, and of his

being the sovereign monarch of the world? Nay, he puts in his claim for more, if more can be thought of, as it is worded in the *Bulla in Cæna*, article 24. "All the rights of the apostolic see and holy church of Rome, howsoever and whensoever obtained or to be obtained." — "Howsoever obtained," that is, you are not to enquire whether right or wrong: and "whensoever," that is, you are not to go back to antiquity, or the institution, or look further than the present possession, which with him gives right, when it is for him. And "to be obtained," secures any new acquisitions he can make, and all his future pretences. This is like swearing *et cæteras*. And now I think the plenitude of his power is sufficiently guarded! And all this is included in the regalia of St. Peter, and the rights of the Roman church, to which the bishops of France, as well as of other Popish countries, are sworn, if they take that oath sincerely, that is, according to the known and declared sense of the imposer.

L. But I suppose this oath must have been taken away, if that model of church government had gone on which was proposed by the parliament of Paris (and no doubt with the king's approbation) that a council of the bishops, &c. in France should be constituted by his majesty to dispose of vacant bishoprics, &c. and determine all ecclesiastical matters, without any appeal or recourse to Rome.

G. And it had gone on, but for the success of that confederacy formed by Pope Innocent XI. against the King of France, to re-establish his supremacy

there. In order to which he sent a nuncio to our late King James to invite him to be head of that confederacy. But he who had learnt no other than French popery, absolutely refused, and opposed the encroachments of the Pope's supremacy, as appears plainly by his concurrence with Monsieur Barillon, the French ambassador, then residing with him, to cause the Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris against the Pope's supremacy, to be translated into English, and printed at London in the year 1688, which was his last of reigning here. And the Pope had this for his excuse, that he could not otherwise have carried on his confederacy, than by concerting the deposition of King James; who would not have agreed to the first of the articles sworn at the Hague, by the princes, allies, and confederates, in February, 1691, and printed here at that time, *viz.* "That no peace be made with Lewis XIV, till he has made reparation to the holy see for whatsoever he has acted against it; and till he annul and make void all those infamous proceedings against the holy father, Innocent XI." In the treaty of King William with Spain, bearing date, Dec. 31, 1690, it is stipulated, "Art. 4, that all things in the ecclesiastics (in France) should be restored as in their former state."

Now if King James would not come into these things, was there not sufficient reason for the Pope to exercise his deposing power against him, in the best manner that he could? And if he had such power from God, then King James had no injury to com-

plain of as done to him, being deposed by his lawful superior.

L. You recal to my mind the astonishment we were in here at the cold reception, and even slights put upon the Earl of Castlemain, ambassador of King James at Rome, while a Protestant doctor, no ways acceptable there upon his own account, and some others, were caressed in an extraordinary manner. But the event of things explains their conduct. And now we see the reason why Innocent XI. was then called here the Protestant Pope, because he took part against King James and helped on the Revolution. And I have been told, that at that time the Pope did require of King James his promise to use his endeavours to have the oath of supremacy taken away in England. And that his Majesty did positively refuse it, which some of us wondered at here. But that another did promise it, and in this, was as good as his word, and has taken this stumbling-block out of the way.

G. King James's fate was very hard, he was abdicated in England, because he was a Papist: and the Pope wrought his deposition, because he was too much a Protestant. And such Protestants are the French reckoned at Rome, they are called there *heretici tolerati*, "tolerated heretics." Nor would they be tolerated, if the Pope could help it, that is, if he durst imitate the example of his predecessor, the new saint, Pope Pius V. to depose the sovereign, absolve the subjects from their allegiance, and inter-

dict the kingdom. But that experiment proved so fatal to the Pope in England, that it is not likely it will ever be tried again, either in France or any where else. The thunder of the Vatican is spent, and become a *brutum fulmen*. The Emperor keeps Commachio still, notwithstanding it is particularly named, by the Latin name *Comaclum*, in the *Bulla in Coena*. The 2d article damns all who appeal from the Pope to a future council; yet have we seen it done in form by the King of France and the Parliament of Paris; and that very bull named and thrown off without any regard. And the whole Gallican church are under this excommunication in almost all the articles of it, by the four memorable propositions which were established in the general assembly of their bishops and clergy in the year 1682, upon which the Pope refused his bull to the bishops there, as is complained of in the Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris, and was the ground of their quarrel with Pope Innocent XI. And the learned Du Pin wrote his treatise before mentioned *De la Puissance Ecclesiastique*, &c. in defence of these propositions against all the objections of the Pope and church of Rome.

L. You should have said the court of Rome.

G. I understand not the distinction. If you mean nothing by the church of Rome but a general council, then there is no church of Rome now in the world, but if there be a church of Rome, where shall we look for it but at Rome? And what is it there but the Pope and his cardinals? And is not that it which you call the court of Rome? Where then is the difference?

L. We own the Pope to be the first and the chief of the bishops, and as such keep communion with him, as it is said in the Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris, p. 51.

G. The precedence of bishops is not a matter of that consequence as to break the peace of the church for it, or which of them should be president in a council. If that were all the difference, the bishop of Rome should have it with all my heart, or any other bishop they should agree upon. And if this were all that is meant by the supremacy of the Pope, we should not trouble the world much about it. But he will not be content with any such thing. The supremacy he claims is no less than an absolute sovereignty over all the churches and kingdoms of the earth, their bishops and their kings. And this not by any ecclesiastical constitution, or grant of temporal princes, which might be conditional, limited, and revocable, and would infer their superiority to him ; but by a divine and indefeasible right, as successor of St. Peter, and heir of all the promises made to him, unalterable, unlimitable, and unaccountable to any power upon earth.

L. Whatever he means by his supremacy, we mean no such thing, or other than that he is the first or chief of the bishops, and as such, think ourselves obliged to keep communion with him.

G. But when he means one thing by his supremacy, and you mean another, and he has sufficiently declared what he means by it, and requires your owning it and swearing to it, for his security ; who deal most sincerely with him, we, who not believing any such su-

premacý in him, will neither own it nor swear to it : or you, who not believing it more than we, in the sense you know he means it, yet own it in general terms, but in a quite contrary sense to what you know he means, and trusts to as his security ? We disown it, and fight against it : you fight against it as much as we, yet seem to own it.

L. But though we differ from the Pope upon the point of his supremacy, yet we keep communion with him.

G. Is not excommunication putting a man out of communion ?

L. Yes, for so is the word *excommunicate*, that is, to put out of communion.

G. Can a man be said then to be in the communion of a bishop who has excommunicated him ?

L. No, I think not, else excommunication signifies nothing.

G. Then none can be truly said to be in communion with the Pope who are excommunicated by him every year, in the *Bulla in Cœna* : and that is all France, and you, my lord, and all who are on your side of the question concerning the supremacy of the Pope, for that is the main, almost the only subject of that bull.

L. But all casuists do agree, that an excommunication does not bind, which is made *clave errante*, that is, where the judge passes sentence through misinformation, inadvertence or of malice, self-designs, or other sinister motive ; in these the judge has erred, and also where he has exceeded his authority, and

extended it to things that are not subject to it ; in these cases the sentence is unjust, and will not be ratified in heaven.

G. But who is judge whether the sentence be pronounced *clave errante* or not ? and how far the Pope's authority does extend ? He has excommunicated you, all of you, " as if each one were particularly named," for so it is expressed in the bull. On the other hand, you despise this bull, and say, with the Parliament of Paris, that he has hereby excommunicated himself ! and so you have a head of the church who is excommunicated ! And so of every Pope who gives his sanction to this bull, that is, all the Popes in our time, and long before. And from whose communion is the Pope of Rome excommunicated ? is there any other communion but that of Rome ? is a person excommunicated no longer a member of the church ? and can he then be the head of it ? These are matters of no small importance, no less than whether we are members of the church, or cut off from it. You are cut off, says the Pope and church of Rome. No, says France to them, you yourselves are cut off. And yet these two churches are the same ! And is there no judge in this case ? is every man left to his own private judgment ? How then have we been teased with that question, who shall be judge ? This answers all objections with you ; for begin at what point of Popery we will, and bring arguments never so convincing, we are always stopt with this question, who shall be judge ? And so you refer all to the authority of your church. But when you answer this as to

your own case, you will have answered it as to us too.

If the Pope is supreme head of the universal church, he must have power of excommunication over all in his own communion, that is, according to his scheme, over all Christians in the world. And to dispute the validity of his excommunication, is a total denial of his supremacy, and setting up another supreme above him. And who is that? Who is judge whether his excommunication is valid, or not? And by what authority does he judge? It must be by some authority superior to that of the Pope: and so he is supreme over the supreme.

But if the Pope's excommunication stands (without which his supremacy falls) we may say, who then can be saved? All the Christian kings and princes that are or ever were in the world, even those of his own communion, particularly in England, as well before the Reformation as since, are altogether cursed and anathematized to the pit of hell, by the *Bulla in Cœna*; and with them, all their bishops, divines, parliaments, judges, lawyers, clerks, printers and publishers, or any others who have in any manner of way been aiding, assisting, or consenting, though tacitly, to the contravention of their princes to any part of this bull; that is, as I said before, almost every one above the condition of a ploughman, are hereby all damned, by all the authority the Pope has. Therefore have a care of giving him too much, for he will take all any body will give. He accepted this from Bellarmin, that "if the Pope should command the

practice of vice, and forbid virtue, the church were bound to believe vice to be good, and virtue to be wicked.* Nay his own canon law saith, that "if the Pope were so wicked, as to carry with him innumerable people by troops as slaves to hell, to be with himself for ever tormented; yet no mortal man whatever must presume here to reprove his faults, because he is judge of all, and himself to be judged of none."† So then they must keep their reproofs, and not endeavour to stop the career till they are with him in hell, for then I suppose his supremacy ceases! Behold the machine of human invention, which God never thought of, nor ever once mentioned, of climbing to heaven by a sort of mechanism, upon a ladder of popes, cardinals, councils, &c. And though we see them leading us by troops into hell, we must give no obstruction, because it would break the machine of their being our infallible guides to heaven!

L. But after all, if you could find an infallible guide, whom you believed to be so, it would give you much ease, and be a comfort to you.

G. But I must have some reason to believe him to be such a guide. And I could not be more sure of it, than of the truth of that reason upon which I did believe it. So that all recurs upon my own reason still. And if my reason misleads me in this, it is the most fatal delusion, because it stops all methods of recovery, when I have once given to another the dominion over my faith. But this the apostles dis-

* *De Rom. Pont.* l. 4. c. 5.

† *Decret.* part 1. dist. 40. can. 6. Si. Papa.

claimed, for when they exhorted the churches, they said, "Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy : for by faith ye stand,"* that is, by your own faith. And "if we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you, let him be accursed."† Did not this make them judges whether any new gospel or doctrine was preached unto them ? And our Saviour bids them stick to their own judgment, and said unto them, "Yea, and why even of your own selves judge ye not what is right ?"‡ and, "if I do not the works of my father, believe me not."§ Was not this appealing to their judgment, whether he did the works of his father, or not ? And as many as followed their own judgment they believed on him : but they who were tied up implicitly to the authority of the church, they rejected him, they said, "have any of the rulers, or of the Pharisees believed on him ? But this people who knoweth not the law are cursed."||

L. If a man durst dispute the methods of Providence, it would seem strange that God did not order it so, as that the church should have first known their Messiah when he came, and have declared him to the people, and then they all would have believed on him.

G. The apostle says, "That the foolishness of God is wiser than men."¶ And he gives the reason in the words following, why "God chose the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, that no

* 2. Cor. i. 24.

† Gal. i. 8.

‡ Luke, xii. 57.

§ John, x. 37.

|| John, vii. 48.

¶ 1. Cor. i. 25.

flesh should glory in his presence ; but he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." And he applieth this to the case we are upon, to the revelation of Jesus Christ when he came. For if he had been received upon the declaration and authority of the church, we had gloried in the church, whose authority would have been prior and superior to that of Christ himself, as being the ground upon which we believed him. But as the sun cannot be seen but by his own light, so God and Christ cannot otherwise be known ; no adventitious or borrowed light can shew the original light whence all lesser lights are derived, which, like the moon and stars, disappear at the presence of the sun. So the church disappeared at the presence of Christ, who was known by his own light only, " We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."* Here was no going to the church to know which was he ? Or if you had, she would have misled you. It would have been like going to the moon to ask where the sun was. The church is the moon, and the stars are the particular bishops and doctors, and other eminent men : but Christ is the sun of righteousness, and he will not give his glory to another.

L. But few believed Christ when he came, or in all his life, for it is said, that " he was to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness."†

G. The stumbling-block to the Jews was the authority of their church against him, as I have shewed. And the Greeks, that is, the Gentiles, could not till

* John, i. 14. † 1 Cor. i. 23.

after the resurrection of Christ have any notion of the economy of our redemption by him. Nor was he preached unto them till after the vision of the sheet to St. Peter, Acts, x. For the Gospel was to be preached to the Jews first, but when they rejected it, leaning upon the infallibility of their church, then it was sent to the Gentiles* ; who being free from that stumbling-block of the church, received it readily, and now make up the whole body of the Christian church throughout the world.

And this teaches us another thing, that is, that an infallible guide (supposing such a one) would not be an infallible assurance to us, unless we were infallible too: for besides our not knowing him, or mistaking another for him, for there has been false Christs, we might misunderstand his doctrine, and turn it to quite contrary purposes from what he intended. This was the case in our Saviour's time. He was a guide truly infallible, and yet how few followed him, notwithstanding all his miracles and heavenly doctrine? Therefore while we are fallible ourselves, and liable to errors and mistakes, in vain do we grope after an infallible assurance, otherwise than the evidence of things makes them plain to that reason which God has given us.

The Angels of Heaven fell: Adam fell from his innocency. And the seven Bishops who were the seven stars in the right hand of Christ, and the seven golden candlesticks,† the seven churches in the midst.

* Acts xiii. 46.

† Rev. i. 20.

of which he walked, these all are fallen; and what are we that we expect infallibility? What bishop, what church now is so infallibly seated as these beloved seven were? What church has a promise of being exempted from that general defection which is foretold will be before the second coming of Christ, when he shall not find faith upon the earth? Or may we not rather think, that the plea of infallibility in the church of Rome (so many ways detected) which hides repentance from her eyes, and hinders her to return from any of her errors, which by this means continually flow without any ebbing on any side; I say, may we not think this always increasing corruption the chief cause to bring on that universal defection in the latter times? Does it not seem to hasten apace, to be even at the doors, when we see no absurdity so great, no text of Scripture so full and express, to be too hard for this infallibility? Not the denying of all our outward senses at once, and owning that we neither see, hear, feel, taste, nor smell! Not the express institution of the Lord's Supper in both kinds, to which the council of Constance claps a *non obstante*, and takes away the cup from the laity! Not the authority and strong reasoning of the Apostles, 1 Cor. xiv. against public prayer in an unknown tongue! All these are over-ruled by infallibility! And many more we have to instance in the particular doctrines in dispute with the church of Rome: in all which, by virtue of her unlimited and infallible power of interpretation, she leaves no text of Scripture of any meaning, other than she thinks fit to put upon them, let

the words be never so express. And this indeed is no other than taking the Scriptures wholly from us, while we must not read them with our own understanding. And the result of this is, that the whole foundation of our faith is in the church of Rome, without Scripture or any thing else, because the Scripture and every thing else is put absolutely and implicitly in her power. And yet no man alive knows what this church of Rome is, or where to be found? I mean that church of Rome to which the infallibility is annexed. For if you travel to Rome, you will see nothing there but what, by a modern distinction, you call the court of Rome. Where then is this infallible church of Rome? Some place it in the Pope alone, as the only heir of St. Peter, and living judge of controversy, and therefore above all councils, and the whole body of the church put together: others like not this, and because some Popes have proved heretical, and have been censured and deposed for it; and others of them have proved most wicked and flagitious men, who besides the viciousness of their own lives, have filled the world with blood, rebellions, and usurpations, in pursuance of the deposing power they have assumed over Princes. For these and other reasons, they would not have the infallibility trusted with the Pope, but lodge it in a general council, as superior to the Pope, with power to reform and even to depose him: a third party approve of neither of these ways, for as they think the Pope alone without a council, not to be infallible, so neither the council without the Pope, who is the head of it, and without

whom there cannot be a lawful council, as not a parliament without the King, these are for King and Parliament, and place the supremacy and infallibility in neither Pope nor council apart, but only when both together and agreeing; but because this will defeat several of those councils called general, and split others, as when the Pope or his legates withdrew from the council (like a King leaving his Parliament) then such was no longer a lawful council, but a schismatical conventicle, as was said of the councils of Constance and Basil, &c. and because there have been Popes against Popes, and councils against councils; and that the requisites necessary to constitute a lawful council and consequently infallible, or some of them disputed, as the authority of summoning and convening the council, and presiding in it; and other requisites allowed by all to be necessary, are impossible to be known with any certainty, as, that all the fathers there met should use all diligence to examine and canvass to the bottom every point that comes before them; and that they should be under no terror or fear of any, nor 'biassed by party, hopes of preferment or gain, or any other corrupt passion, but doing all things out of true zeal to the glory of God, and good of the church; otherwise that there is no infallibility follows that council; and this being impossible for any to know but God alone, consequently the infallibility of all councils is rendered precarious, and no certainty at all in them; or rather it is certain, by the histories of all general councils, that *these human passions*, not consistent with infallibili-

ty, had an influence in all or most of them; so that we cannot be certain of the infallibility of any council, unless we are infallibly sure that none of these human passions had a mixture in it. This makes a fourth party in the church of Rome, that is, of those who place the infallibility neither in Pope nor council, jointly or severally, but in the church militant, as they speak, that is, the church diffusive, or all churches up and down the world. We must then travel and learn. Here is a wide mark, and we are plainly left at last to our own private judgment, to collect and compare, to approve or reject what we find scattered in all the distant churches upon earth. And no man's life or capacity will be sufficient to make the inquiry, in any tolerable measure.

And now, my lord, which of these four sorts of infallibility will you take? There are three to one against you, choose which you will. And all these are of the church of Rome. And what difference is there betwixt having no guide, or one you cannot find?

L. If I cannot find him, I have him not; and that is all one as to have none.

Miserable man! If he has no infallible guide, and is fallible himself; and yet upon his going right depends his eternal either happiness or misery.

G. You may as well find fault with the creation. "Shall the clay say to the potter, why hast thou made me thus?" Who was guide to the angels that fell? Who was guide to Adam? Who was, or who is, guide to all the earth? To the Heathens, Maho-

metans, to Jews? These last stick to their church, as an infallible guide, and therefore are most obstinate, and the most inveterate enemies to Christianity. Who is guide to infants and to idiots? And shall we interrogate the Almighty what he will do with these, or why he created them? And perhaps the greatest part of mankind die before they come to the years of discretion: and when they are of age, how few are capable to judge, or have opportunity or capacity to examine the different pleas betwixt church and church, religion and religion? And do we not see the generality of the world take up their church and religion just according to their education? My lord, if you and I had been born and bred in Turkey, we might have been Mahometans.

L. Is religion then nothing but a chance, according to the place we are born in or where we receive our education?

G. No, my lord, truth is truth, though all the world should depart from it. And there have been converts in all nations and religions. But none where men cannot be persuaded to overcome the prejudice of education, and examine impartially for themselves. But infallibility bars all examination, for that implies a doubt, and brings us to private judgment, and where then shall we wander? And yet you must apply to every man's private judgment when you would make him a convert to your church, why else do you argue or reason with him? Must he not then examine all the arguments and motives you give him for the infallibility of your church, and judge for himself

whether they are well grounded, and will bear the test of reason? Or must every body have reason and examine but yourselves? Believe it then you are in the most dangerous condition of any. And you are the men who receive your religion by chance, just according to your education. Suppose another should return your own answer to you, and say, I will not examine, I am infallibly sure, and I will hear no more: what would you think of such a man? Every enthusiast will tell you the same. He will take his oath that he is infallible! and will hear no more than the deaf adder the charms of reason; but he will bid you silence your reason, for that is it which blinds you, though Solomon calls it the "lamp of God," which he hath planted in our heart, Prov. xx. 27. This is the image of God, in which he created us, and will be our judge and witness in the last day, as it is given us for our guide here. But instead of trimming this lamp, to make it burn clearly, we hear the general cry from your side, "put it out; put it out;" we cannot deal with you until that lamp be extinguished, it thwarts us every turn, and starts a hundred objections, that we cannot believe peaceably for it. But when it is quite taken away (if that were possible to be done) then you offer to shew us a meteor of infallibility (about which yourselves are not agreed, nor know where to find it) which will keep us from ever doubting any more. As when a man's eyes are put out, he cannot see a dirty step or a precipice before him, and then he is in that state of security you propose.

L. You see how this guide of yours, this lamp of reason has misled the nations ; for Heathens, Mahometans, &c. all plead reason.

G. And we have no other method with them than to reason on still with them, and shew them that reason is of our side. And vast multitudes of them have been thus converted, even all the Christian churches now in the world ; for all of them are of the Gentiles. And for those who yet remain unconverted, or have not had the Gospel sufficiently proposed to them, we must leave them to God who made them, and will require from no man more than he has given him, but will judge all people righteously. Of this I have spoke before.

But I observe that since this notion of infallibility came into the church of Rome, it has rooted out all charity, and her religion has been chiefly employed in cursing and damning all the world but herself. Her canons are tagged with anathemas upon every occasion, and you hear little in them of who shall be saved, but every page is full of who must be damned. And the *Bulla in Cæna* pins the basket, and leaves very few to escape, even of the Roman communion itself.

It is a common argument with which your priests frighten women and children, *viz.* “ you Protestants say it is impossible for a Papist to be saved : but we Papists say, it is impossible for a Protestant to be saved : therefore it is safer being of our side.” But this has turned to their confusion, for as there is nothing in it but a confident avering, it shews that they

against the Errors of the Time.

have no charity, which is greater even than faith self, 1 Cor. xiii. 13. And therefore that they can be no Christian church : their want of charity being this much plainer than our want of faith. T. Chillingworth's answer to this, chap. vii. of his works p. 306. " You " (says he to Knot the Jesuit) " va-
pretend, that all Roman Catholics, not one excepted, profess that protestantcy unrepented destroys salvation. From which generality we may except two at least, by my knowledge, and these are, yourself, and Francis de Sancta Clara, who assures us, that ignorance and repentance may excuse a Protestant from damnation though dying in his error. And this is all the charity which by your own confession also, the most favorable Protestants allow to Papists."

Militiere was persuaded that King Charles I. was happy in heaven, because he preferred the Catholic faith before his crown, his liberty, his life. [Not known to all the world that King Charles I. died in the communion of the church of England, which he declared with his last breath upon the scaffold.] But Archbishop Bramhall gave him this answer, " that which you have confessed here concerning King Charles, will spoil your former demonstration, ' that the Protestants have neither church nor faith.' But you confess no more here than I have heard some of your famous Roman doctors acknowledge to be true in general; and no more than that which the Bishop of Chalcedon (a man that cannot be suspected of partiality on our side) hath recorded and published in two of his books to the world."

print. That *Protestantibus credentibus*, &c. ‘ persons living in the communion of the Protestant church, if they endeavour to learn the faith, and are not able to attain unto it; but hold it implicitly in the preparation of their minds, and are ready to receive it when God shall be pleased to reveal it (which all good Protestants, and all good Christians are) they neither want church, nor faith, nor salvation.’ ”

L. Militiere supposed that King Charles I. secretly and invisibly in the last moments of his life, was by God’s spirit united to the Roman Catholic church.

G. Then no Protestant, at least no Protestant King, need despair—but to these divines let us add some royal testimonies. King James I. in his *Præmonition* to Christian Monarchs, tells us, “ that his mother (Queen Mary) as she was ready to lay her head upon the block, sent him this message; ‘ that although she was of another religion than that wherein he was brought up, yet she would not press him to change, except his conscience forced him to it, not doubting but if he led a good life, and were careful to do justice and govern well, he would be in a good case in his own religion.’ ”

This was perfectly agreeable to the sentiments of his grandson the late King James II. who often spoke to those divines who had the instruction of both his daughters, to be diligent in making them religious and good Christians, in the way of the church of England, without so much as hinting at any change of their principles towards the church of Rome, as I

have heard myself from two of them, Dr. Turner, late Lord Bishop of Ely, and Dr. Ken, late Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells. And neither before nor after his coming to the crown would he suffer any attempt to be made upon them as to religion, of which there is an eminent witness now alive, who knows if I speak truth. And when a certain zealot pressed him to endeavour their reconciliation to the church of Rome, and offered his service for the purpose; the King answered, "no, let them alone, they are so good they will be saved in any church."

L. It is strange then he should be a Roman Catholic himself.

G. Not at all, for he might think that best for him, without thinking those in hazard who were sincerely of the church of England, and lived up to the rules of it.

L. He could not think it lawful to be present at your common prayers.

G. He did not think it unlawful; because he heard them at his coronation.

L. That was upon a particular occasion. But does any Roman Catholic think it lawful to hear them constantly or frequently?

G. They did think so, for after the Reformation the Roman Catholics of England came to our churches and to our common prayer without any scruple. And this continued till about the tenth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when Pope Pius V. forbade it by his bull. So that he made the separation, and if he had not sufficient power to do it, or that there was not sufficient cause for it, then he made the schism too,

and it lies wholly at his door. Now it is the undoubted right of every national church to reform, alter, and model their liturgy as shall be most convenient, provided there be nothing put into it that is contrary to the faith, which is not so much as alleged against our public offices. They have a breviary at Milan and in other places, different from that at Rome. And in England before the Reformation there were divers in several dioceses, as what was used in the church of Salisbury, of Hereford, of Bangor, of York, of Lincoln, &c. as is mentioned in the preface to our Common-Prayer Book, concerning the service of the church. But these differences did not break communion, nor did the alteration made at the Reformation, till the Pope by the plenitude of his supremacy, and to be revenged upon Queen Elizabeth, took upon him to break the communion. For which as there was no sufficient cause, our liturgy being all orthodox, even our enemies being judges; so on the other hand, the Pope's supremacy did not extend to break in upon the rights and liberties of any national church, as has been and is still maintained by the whole Gallican church, and others the most learned in the church of Rome. And, my lord, I know some Roman Catholics of figure and good sense in England, who merely upon this account have come over to our church, and thought themselves obliged to return to the communion of their national church, and to heal the breach made by that excess of the Pope's supremacy, which no sober man on this side the Alps will own. It is strange to own it in fact, and yet deny it

in words. Whoever owns this bull of Pius V. for breaking communion in England, must also own the full extent of the *Bulla in Cœna*, which has his authority, in a particular manner, as well as of all the Popes since. And it damns almost all the Papists, as well as all who are not Papists.

L. We desire not to be called Papists, we think it a word of contempt, as if we were only partisans for the Pope, and of that party or faction of Christians who would raise his power above the church and everything else.

G. I am glad your lordship thinks so, and indeed the church of France (where you were bred) are not Papists in this sense. They are got free, in a good measure, from the servitude of the Pope. But they are still Roman Catholics.

L. We do not delight in that word neither, as if our Catholicism were tied only to Rome; we term ourselves Catholics in general, as members of the Catholic or Universal Church.

G. We call ourselves so too, and in the same sense, and pray every day for the Catholic church in our liturgy. Therefore we call not you Catholics, because it would not distinguish you from us. But Roman Catholics is calling a part the whole.

L. You know the meaning, not that the particular church of Rome is all the churches in the world, but she is called Catholic, as being the head and principle of unity and communion to all other churches.

G. If this be the frame of the Catholic church, it must have been so always.

L. Yes surely, for there was always a Catholic church, that is, some particular church, so called, in the same sense as Rome is now.

G. Pray then, my lord, tell me what particular church was so called, in this sense, before there was a Christian in Rome? And how came that church to lose it? And how was it transferred to Rome?

Every bishop, every church, and every member of it, may be called Catholic, and were so called, as being included in the general notion of the Catholic church; but in the sense you have mentioned, as head and principle of unity to all churches, no bishop or church ever had it, till taken up in the latter times by the bishop and church of Rome.

L. But how came the bishop of Rome to that great sway he has long obtained in the church?

G. It is very obvious, because Rome was the metropolis of the empire: and consequently her bishop must be more conspicuous than any other, have more respect payed him, and more applications made to him, especially after the emperors became Christian. And for the same reason, when the seat of the empire was translated to Constantinople, the bishop of that church took upon him, and aspired further to an universal supremacy, but was opposed by Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome. There was no other consideration then for the superiority of one bishop or church, but the secular dignity of the place; for which reason the Patriarch of Jerusalem (which was incontestably the mother church of all) was postponed, and made the lowest of all the patriarchs. But for divine right, and

Christ having named any one bishop or church as head and superior to all others, there is not a word. And it could not be Rome before Rome was Christian; and Christ never named her upon any occasion whatsoever, or gave the least hint towards her, or that possibly can be applied to her. Strange and unaccountable! If he meant to build the whole Christian faith upon her, and to make her the Catholic church, as including all other churches of Christians, and in all ages throughout the whole world!

But, my lord, fact (as I said before) is the surest way to give us a true light of things. And the frame or government of the church is a fact which must be determined by histories and records, not criticising upon words that afford no certainty. Let us look, therefore, into the frame of the church, from the beginning. I hope I have made it plain from the history of the Acts of the Apostles, that there was none of them appointed as sovereign over the others, whatever words may be strained in favour of St. Peter; for if he was called a “rock or foundation,” so were all the others, they are called the “twelve foundations” of the church: * which is said to be built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; † and not any particular prophet or apostle. And if the keys of Heaven were promised to Peter, ‡ this was fulfilled in giving them to him jointly with all the others, without any mark of superiority in him;

* Rev. xxi. 14:

† Eph. ii. 20.

‡ Matth. xvi. 19.

as in the commission to "teach all nations,"* it was equal to them all. And we find, in fact, that it was exercised by them all with equal authority.

And all the regimen of the church, which the apostles appointed was that of bishops in their several districts, without any head or sovereign bishop over them all, as supreme judge of controversy: of which there is not the least tittle to be found in any of the histories or writings of those ages next after the apostles; though there were many controversies even in faith among them, which an appeal to this judge had speedily ended; but no such thing appears, which could not have been missed had it been known. Metropolitans were early, that is, the bishop of the metropolis or chief city of a province, who did preside in the synods of that province, and had other ecclesiastical privileges granted him, by the common consent of the bishops of the province, for order sake, and greater harmony of discipline. But a patriarch, with jurisdiction over several metropolitans or provinces, was never heard of in the church, till the council of Chalcedon, 450 years after Christ. And many provinces were not put under these patriarchs, but had exempt jurisdiction of their own, as before, of which Britain was one; for the patriarchat of Rome extended only to Italy and the isles adjacent. But the first pretence to universal supremacy was set up by John bishop of Constantinople, after the seat of the empire was translated thither, against whom Gregory the Great wrote, and said that though his see of Rome had always the

* Matth. xxviii. 19.

precedence of Constantinople, yet that none of his predecessors, the bishops of Rome, had ever assumed such an arrogant title, which he calls "a Luciferian pride," and declares him who should take it to be the forerunner of Antichrist.* And yet his next successor but one, that is Boniface III. did take it, being given him by Phocas, that traitor and usurper, who murdered his master Mauricius, the emperor, and seized his throne, whom Boniface owned and abetted, and was made universal bishop for his reward, in the beginning of the seventh century. Thus the supremacy now claimed by Rome was introduced, and has been maintained, *pro viribus*, ever since. And under this, Britain has been subdued, which never was under the patriarchat of Rome: so much has the government and unity of the church been altered from what it was in the apostles' time; or in the first ages of the church. And thus has Rome usurped the name of the Catholic church, and placed all its unity in submission to her bishop! Here we see the degrees by which this encroachment crept on; the patriarchat began in the fifth, and the universal supremacy in the seventh century. And Britain, which held it out against the patriarchat of Rome, was at last conquered by the more apparent usurpation of her universal supremacy, so obtained as I have told.

And yet I have heard some Britains say, that though they thought the church of Rome the most

* Epist. Lib. ii. Ep. 32, 36, 38. Lib. vii. Ep. 39, 36, &c.

corrupt part of the Christian church, both as to doctrine and worship, and to be a cage full of unclean birds; yet that they must be of her, and enter into that cage, because she was the Catholic church: This is like that desperate maxim in the canon law; I quoted before out of the decretals, that "though the Pope should draw infinite numbers of people with him into hell, yet we must not find fault with him, nor reprove him," &c.

And I must observe also here, that though France has thrown off the Pope's infallibility, and his deposing power over princes, and has limited his supremacy, that is indeed taken it wholly away, for no supremacy (properly so called) can be limited, for then it ceases to be supreme: yet France remains still in the dregs of the corruptions of Rome, both as to doctrine and worship. The religion of the people there, is the adoration of the host and of the cross, invocation of saints, worship of images, praying souls out of purgatory, telling their beads, and going to confession.

L. I have heard yourself say, that confession was a good thing, rightly used.

G. And so I say still, but not in that sense it is generally used with you, and is expressed in your *Catechism ad Parochos, de Pœnitentiæ Sacramento*, sect. 46, 47. That such a repentance as God will not accept, nor pardon for it, is made sufficient by the sacrament of penance, and all our sins remitted by it. And that, *paucissimi*, very few can be saved without it. They might have said none, for they here require in repentance acceptable to God, a sense

and sorrow for sin that shall be fully equal to the demerit, *ut cum scelerum magnitudine æquari conferrique possit*, which is impossible for mortal man; and therefore all must be damned without this sacrament of penance. And they say, it was necessary that God should institute this sacrament, as an easier way for men to get to heaven. *Quare necesse fuit ut clementissimus Dominus faciliori ratione communi hominum salutî consuleret*. An easy way indeed! Confess to a priest and get absolution, and this makes up the defects of your repentance, and you are saved, *ex opere operato*, by the work wrought, by the bare performance of this sacrament. And the Council of Trent anathematizes all those who say that the very sacraments of the gospel do not confer grace in the same manner, by the bare performance. *Si quis dixerit per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam—anathema sit*. Sess. 7. can. 8. It is true that God did institute his sacraments as means of grace, (for which we bless his name daily in our General Thanksgiving) but this turns them into charms, when the very sacraments themselves, *ipsa sacramenta*, confer the grace, *ex opere operato*, by the bare performance of the work.

Let us exemplify this to ourselves by the like use made of the institutions of God under the law. The Jews had got this notion of the *opus operatum*, that the bare performance of the letter of the law, in their sacrifices, feasts, fasts, and other observances, was all that was required of them. Whence the voices of all the prophets were against these institutions, they call

them iniquity, abomination, and hateful to God. Nay, God denies that he did require them, or ever did institute them.* That is, as a dead carcase without a soul, and working like charms by the bare *opus operatum*. God did never institute such, nor does require them at our hands. And may we not say, no more under the gospel than the law? For the gospel introduced a more pure and spiritual worship, but the Council of Trent by naming only the sacraments of the new law, applies the *opus operation* to them also, if not chiefly.

What else is the meaning of tying men to the repetition of such a precise number of *Ave-s* and *Pater-s* and *Credo-s*, at such particular times, whether the mind goes along with them, or not? For you will see people in the markets, buying and selling, or discoursing of common business, and dropping their beads all the while, to keep count if they have rightly performed their task of the *opus operatum*.

But if prayers and sacraments, which are means of grace of God's own institution, may be thus abused, and rendered hateful to God: what shall we say of those means of grace which are of man's mere invention? None can appoint the means but he who has the bestowing of the end to be obtained by those means: as if I have a thousand pounds to bestow; I may put what conditions I think fit, and appoint the means for the obtaining it; and none else can appoint the means. Now grace is the gift of the Holy Ghost, and none can appoint the means of obtaining it, but

* Isa. i. 11, 12, 13, 14. Jer. vii. 22.

who has the bestowing of the Holy Ghost; which it is the highest blasphemy for any creature to assume to himself; hence Christ's sending the Holy Ghost is a sure proof of his divinity: but the church of Rome takes upon her to appoint means of grace, many and various; the whole pontifical is made up of the forms of consecration of every thing almost one can think of into means of grace, as bells, books, candles, water, salt, oil, ashes, palms, swords, banners, and vestments of divers sorts, even to children's clouts, besides crosses, pictures, images, *Agnus Dei*-s, &c. By the use of which, in the manner prescribed, several graces, both ghostly and bodily, are said to be obtained, as besides the favour of God, and the remission of sins, the saving from fire, from diseases, from storms at sea, thunder, lightning, and tempest at land, at which times they ring their consecrated bells, to allay the winds, and chase away the dæmons of the air, who seeing the sign of the cross upon such bells, and hearing their sound, shall be frightened and fly away, as it is expressed in the form of consecration of bells in the pontifical. Nay there is nothing in the world so insignificant, a rose, or a feather, which the Pope may not consecrate into a means of grace, and is in use every day. And at Rome they are counted atheists who have not faith in these things. So much they place their religion in them!

L. The Dissenters object all this to you, as to your rites, ceremonies, habits, &c.

G. But without any ground, for we consecrate none of these things, nor do we attribute any virtue,

ghostly or bodily, to the use of them, as to the wearing a surplice, hearing a bell. or an organ, &c. they are purely for decency and order, and we may change them, or take them quite away every day, as our governors think fit. Can they shew any outward action or thing appointed in our church, by the use of which evil spirits may be chased away, women helped in labour, or storms at sea quelled? all which and many more virtues are attributed in your church to the use of what you call holy water, and many other such like institutions of mechanical means of grace.

But that which makes up the bulk of the Romish devotions is, the worship and invocation of saints and angels, the adoration of their images, and of the reliques of saints departed, pieces of their bodies or of their vestments, &c. to which great miracles are attributed, and therefore they are made, strictly and properly, means of grace. ,

L. We desire the prayers of one another upon earth, why not much rather of the saints and angels in heaven?

G. Because the one is commanded, the other not, nay forbidden, as I will shew you.

L. It seems to be giving greater glory to God, and more humility in us, not to approach his presence directly and immediately ourselves, as we do not to an earthly king, but by the introduction and recommendation of some eminent courtier whom we know to be in his favour.

G. Your simile will halt on all four, for God is nearer to us than any saint or angel; “in God we

ive and move and have our being ;” but the angels and saints departed are at distance from us, and we know not where to find them, or that they hear our prayers, for they are not every where, that is an attribute of God alone.

L. Therefore our schoolmen say, they see our prayers *in speculo Trinitatis*, in the looking-glass of God.

G. Do they see everything in that looking-glass? Then they know as much as God! But if not, then how do we know they see our prayers there? And how will this sort with your simile of an earthly king, that the courtier must go to the king to know what I desired the courtier to ask of him?

“ Abraham is the father of us all,”* “ and he was called the friend of God.”† Therefore it is likely that he saw as far into that looking-glass as another. Yet it is said, Isa. lxiii. 16, “ that Abraham is ignorant of us.” And are not we as ignorant of their state, and what knowledge they have of us below? We are told that they have no knowledge of it. “ His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.”‡

L. It is said, that the angels of heaven rejoice over a sinner that repenteth.

G. That is when it pleaseth God to let them know it; or that the sinner comes thither. But that they know of every penitent upon earth, is no where said, nor do I know it asserted by any.

* Rom. iv. 16.

† Jam. ii. 23.

‡ Job. xiv. 21.

But instead of the schoolmen's looking-glass and their vain philosophy, if we would look into the plain directions of holy Scripture, we should settle ourselves upon a much surer foundation. See then what the Apostle says upon the very case in hand, "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility (or being a voluntary in humility, as our margin reads it) and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind ; and not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God."* And after says, ver. 23, "Which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will-worship and humility." Here is a full answer to all your pretensions for this will-worship of saints and angels, for both go upon the same foot. It is called "intruding into things we have not seen," of which we are altogether uncertain, and therefore sinful in the practice, by the apostle's rule, Rom. xiv. 23, that "whatsoever is not of faith, is sin." This was spoke in respect of meats, but is much more so as to our worship and solemn devotions to God. Your comparison of access to an earthly king, is here called a fleshly or a carnal thought, measuring God after the manner of men ; and the result of this is no less than losing our reward, that is, heaven ; for it is forsaking the head, which is Christ, whose members we are, and receive nourishment from him ; not so from saints

* Col. ii. 18, 19.

or angels ; God has given Christ to us as the “ one mediator between God and men,” 1 Tim. ii. 5. But we have made to ourselves many mediators to assist and help him, as if his mediation and intercession were not sufficient ; and we make more applications to them than to him, or to God himself. You have ten *Ave Maria*-s for one *Pater Noster*.

And you have multiplied these saints to yourselves without number, like the heathen deities, and new canonizations are going on every day. Every country, city, parish, and almost person, have a particular saint for their patron. You have saints, as they had gods, for the sea, for the air, fire, &c. ; for peace, for war, for learning, and all sorts of trades and occupations, St. Christopher and St. Clement, are for the sea, especially the Virgin Mary, to whom the seamen sing *Ave Maris Stella*. Saint Agatha is for the fire, and they make letters on her day to quench fire with. St. Nicholas and St. Gregory are for scholars ; St. Luke, for painters, &c. And they have saints for all diseases, St. Cornelis cures the falling sickness, St. Roche the pox, St. Apollonia the toothach, &c. And they have particular saints for all beasts and cattle, St. Loy presides over the horses, and St. Anthony over the swine, &c. ; and they bring their cattle to be blessed by these saints on their particular days ; and they pray to these saints jointly with God. A scholar says, “ God and St. Nicholas be my speed ;” and when one sneezes, “ God help and St. John ;” and to a horse if he stumbles, “ God and St. Loy save thee, &c. ;” and upon every surprise they cry, *Jesu Maria* !

L. You should not compare these to the dæmons of the heathens, for they were evil spirits ; and they called them gods.

G. The word *gods* is frequently given in Scripture to angels, and to men as ministers of God ; and thus the heathens understood it, and supposed their gods to be such ministers, as Æolus to govern the winds, Neptune the sea, &c. Therefore, they called them *dii medioximi*, inferior gods, as standing in the middle betwixt the Supreme God and us, to succour or punish us, according to his orders. St. Augustine, who knew them well, tells us what they argued for themselves: they said, “ we do not worship evildæmons or spirits, but we worship those whom you (Christians) call angels, the powers of the great God, the mysteries of the great God.* But St. Augustine answered them, that they must be evil spirits whom they worshipped, because they required worship from men, as the Devil did from our Saviour, which the good angels always refused, and he quotes, Rev. xix. 10. xxii. 9, where the angel forbade John to worship him ; and the same did the saints upon earth, as Peter refused it from Cornelius, and Paul and Barnabas from the men of Lystra, &c.†

L. But we suppose not that the heathens had any notion of the supreme and true God, but that they

* Non colimus mala dæmonia, angelos quos dicitis, ipsos et nos colimus virtutes Dei magni, et mysteria Dei magni.—August. in *Psal.* xcvi.

† Act. x. 26. xiv. 14, 15.

worshipped every one of their gods as supreme and independent.

G. Some men make monsters of others to hide their own deformity ! Your guides have set up this notion, to hinder the parallel betwixt the heathen worship of their inferior gods, and yours of saints and angels. For there is nothing more evident than that the heathen did acknowledge the one supreme and true God, though in much ignorance and superstition. St. Paul said that they “ knew God, that he was manifest unto them, even his eternal power and godhead. So that they were without excuse in their foolish imagination, to change the glory of the incorruptible god into an image made like to corruptible man,” &c.* And he told the Athenians, “ whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.”† He did not preach a false god unto them, but they had blended the worship of God with these inferior gods or dæmons, which was their superstition, for so the word signifies *Ἀνοιδαιμονία*, the fear of these dæmons, and it is thus rendered every where in the New Testament, which we translate *superstition*, and so your own Vulgar Latin, Act. xvii. 22. and xxv. 19. And the Latin word *superstitio* means the same thing, and is derived, as Servius has it from *super stare*, as being a fear of those heavenly powers who *supra stant*, stand over us, and so superstition is *superstantium rerum timor*. Others derive it from *superstites*, that these *devi ex hominibus facti*, men deified after their death, are still *superstites*, and the fear of them as such is supersti-

* Rom. i. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23.

† Act. xvii. 22.

tion ; or *qui superstitem memoriam defunctorum colunt*, who worship the memory of these dead men.

The worship of these lesser gods is what is forbidden in the first commandment, which respects the object of worship, that no religious worship is to be given to any but to the Supreme God alone. The second commandment relates to the manner of worship, that is, by images. But this your church has hid from the people, and divided the tenth into two, to keep up the number, that the people might think they still have the ten commandments : and it is thus in your very *Catechism ad Parochos*. But of this here ft r.

The Heathens had their good and evil *dæmones*, as their good and evil genii, but according to St. Augustine's rule, they must be evil dæmons who accepted the worship of men, which were all the Heathen dæmons, therefore the word *dæmon* is taken in the worst sense, and translated *devil*, throughout the New Testament, and what we translate " the doctrines of devils," 1 Tim. iv. 1 is the doctrine of the *dæmones*, or of the worship of *dæmones*, διδασκαλίαι δαιμονίων and a various lection has it νεκροῖς λατρεύοντες " who worship the dead." The *dæmones* of the Heathen were their dead heroes, whom they made *divi* by an apotheosis ; as the Pope does saints by a canonization. But it is too gross to put it upon the Heathen, that they thought every one of those gods whom they made was the Supreme God who made themselves. They owned these to be lesser gods, and only the virtues and powers of the great God ; and they thought that they honoured the

Supreme God the more, by doing honour to his substitutes; and all their worship was ultimately referred to him. So that “he only was worshipped in all their gods and goddesses; for they made him king of all their gods and goddesses.” *

And the common appellation given to Jupiter in Homer is, Πάτηρ and Βασιλεύς ἀνδρῶν τε Θεῶν τε, “the father and king of the gods as well as of men.” And he represents him as commanding all the other gods, sending them on his errands, calling them to account, and sometimes chastising them. He was called *Majus Deus*, the great God. Lucian in his dialogues brings in Neptune making suit to Mercury, that he might speak with Jupiter.

But besides all these, we have sufficient testimony in Scripture of the Heathens acknowledging the one Supreme and true God. Nebuchadnezzar calls him “God of Gods, and Lord of Kings—the most High God;” and says, “I blessed the most high, and I praised and honoured him that liveth for ever and ever, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom from generation to generation. And all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing: and he doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and no man can stay his hand, or say unto him, what doest thou?” †

* Hi omnes Dii Deæque sit Unus Jupiter. *August. de Civit Dei*. l. iv. c. xi. Ipsum enim Deorum omnium Deærumque Regem esse volunt. *Ib.* c. ix.

† Dan. ii. 47. iii. 26. 29. iv. 34, 35.

Cyrus calls him the "Lord God of Heaven." * And Darius the same, in as high expressions as any Christian could use, "the living God, and steadfast for ever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end, &c." †

L. It is strange that when they acknowledged the great God so fully, they did not forsake their own little gods.

G. No, for they did not think it inconsistent to acknowledge one God above all, and yet to suppose that every nation had its own god, or gods, in subordination to the Supreme God, and as deputies under him. This was their notion. And they supposed that Judea had its own tutelar god, as well as other countries. Therefore the King of Assyria having conquered it, sent to teach his people who went thither, "the manner of the god of the land," ‡ to appease his wrath who had plagued them with lions. But yet they forsook not their own gods, for it is said, "they feared the Lord, and served their own gods." And they allowed the same liberty to the Jews, who were not required in any of their captivities to renounce their own god; but only to worship the gods of the nations where they lived. And of these tutelar gods, they supposed one might be stronger or more powerful than another, and therefore they would boast of their gods, one country against another; thus said Senacherib, "who are they among all the

* *Ezra* i. 2. vi. 10, 12. † *Dan.* vi. 26. ‡ *2 Kin.* xvii. 26, 27, 33.

gods of the countries, that hath delivered their country out of mine hand, that the Lord (the tutelar god of Judea) should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand? Where are the gods of Hamath and of Arpad? &c." * When Moses and Aaron told Pharaoh, that the god of the Hebrews had met with them, he was not offended that they had another god besides those which were worshipped in Egypt; he took it as a thing granted, that every people had their own tutelar god.

This then was the difference betwixt the Jews and Gentiles, the Gentiles thought it lawful to worship the tutelar god of any country, but still in subordination to the most high God, as has been shewed: on the other hand, the Jews were obliged to worship the Lord God, the Supreme God, and Him only, and they were forbid to worship any of the gods of the nations.

But this sin they often fell into, they worshipped these gods, but still in conjunction with the Lord their God, as it is said, they did "worship and swear by the Lord, and swear by Malcham."† But Samuel told them, "if ye return unto the Lord with all your hearts, then put away the strange gods, and Ashtaroth from among you—and serve him only." Then they did put away Baalim and Ashtaroth, and served the Lord only."‡

L. But it is said, that they had forsaken the Lord.

G. It is called forsaking the Lord, when we will not obey his commandments, but worship him other-

* ii. Kin. xviii. 34, 35.

† Zeph. i. 5.

‡ 1 Sam. vii. 3, 4.

wise than he has required, and join others with him, which he has forbidden. He said, "the house of Israel is estranged from me, separated from me through their idols; yet they come and enquire of a prophet concerning me." * And again, "when they had slain their children to their idols, then came they the same day into my sanctuary." † And he says to them, "will ye burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods, and come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my name?" ‡ It is said, "they feared the Lord, and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations." § But it follows immediately, "they fear not the Lord, because they do not after his statutes," wherein he commanded them "not to fear other gods." And again, "they feared the Lord, and served their graven images." Yet this was departing from the fear of the Lord, but not a downright denial of the Supreme God, or throwing him off from being any more their God, and taking any other god in his room as the Supreme God. No, but it was taking other gods with him, of which he says, "oh, do not this abominable thing that I hate." ||

This was the first sin against which God took care to guard in the first commandment, "Thou shalt have none other gods before me, or with me." ¶ And for the distinction that the worship of inferior gods or ministers of God is not here forbidden, we say, *Ubi lex non distinguit, ibi non est distinguendum*, "Where the law does not distinguish, we must not;"

* Ezek. xiv. 5, 7. † Chap. xxiii. 39. ‡ Jer. vii. 9.

§ Kir. xvii. 33, 34, 41. || Jer. xliv. 4. ¶ Exod. xx. 3, 23.

for there is no law but may be distinguished away. And this is exactly the same notion the Heathen had of their *dæmones*. And the worshipping of these or fearing them, is literally what we call superstition. It is a means of grace which God has not appointed.

L. But we have reason to suspect that several of the Heathen *dæmones*, or men deified after they were dead, were supposititious, and that no such men ever were in the world.

G. Many such will be found in the catalogue of your saints. What think you of the Seven Sleepers, who slept three hundred and sixty-two years, and thought it but one night? What think you of the eleven thousand English Virgins, all martyred together at Cologne, and the fine legend told of them? What do you believe of St. George killing the Dragon, and rescuing the King's Daughter? As true as our ballad of the Dragon of Wantly. Yet there are days kept for all these, and offices made for them, with prayers to them, and to God, that we may be saved by these their merits. There are multitudes of the like, which you will find, even to a surfeit, in the devotions of the Roman church, with their breviaries, missals, legends, and authors, quoted at large. And can these prayers be in faith, to persons that never were in being, and for the merit of actions that were never done? This is a means of grace of our own invention indeed!

Besides, many have been canonized for notorious crimes, as our St. Thomas Becket of Canterbury, whose merit was, that he would exempt all ecclesias-

ties from the secular power, though even in civil or criminal causes, which was called asserting the liberties of holy church, and it is fully asserted in the *Bulla in Cœna*. But notwithstanding all these authorities, it is a wicked principle, and dissolves all civil government; it exempts from the king's obedience the first of the three estates of the realm, which has or ought to have the greatest influence upon the people, and transfers their allegiance to another sovereign; which is the highest treason, by the laws of all well governed nations, as well as by the laws of God. Yet, for asserting this, Becket was canonized! and for not giving way to it, the king was whipped by the monks of Canterbury, to which he was forced to submit, in those times of Papal supremacy!

Such another was the last year's saint, Pope Pius V., the great asserter and last practiser of the power of the Pope to depose princes; and who broke the communion of the church of England.

But there is one saint (truly so) of whom I have reserved to speak in the last place, because of the excesses of your church in their devotions to her, bordering even upon blasphemy to any common ear. No less than a canonized person, St. Bonaventure, has published what he calls, "The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary," wherein every one of the hundred and fifty psalms, as likewise the *Te Deum*, and other most solemn adorations of God, are all turned to the Virgin Mary. Rosaries and books of devotion to her are many; here is one translated into English for the use of the Roman Catholics here,

intituled, "The Devotion of Bondage, or the Practice of perfectly consecrating ourselves to the Service of the Blessed Virgin. Permissu Superiorum, 1632." It is licensed and highly recommended both to clergy and people by the Bishop of St. Omers, with several indulgences granted to those who shall devoutly make use of it; wherein we offer up ourselves, both souls and bodies, as bond-slaves to the Blessed Virgin: among whose high prerogatives you will find this the sixth, p. 32, "The sovereign dominion that was given her, not only over the world, but over the Creator of the world." This indeed might well ground that petition made to her, *jure matris, impera filio*. "By the right of a mother, command your son." And her being called "The Mother of the whole Trinity," in the Missal Polon. fol. 237. In the Primer or Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, printed in English, 1699, (and in the exposition before it, said to be of "great antiquity, and composed by the church, directed by the Holy Ghost") you will find many prayers to the Virgin Mary, not only of intercession or praying for us, but to grant us grace, pardon of sin, and eternal life, in as full and positive terms as could be asked of God himself. See the hymn, *Memento rerum conditor*, p. 34; and *Ave Maris Stella*, p. 38; and the prayer to her, p. 59, "Under thy aid"—*Sub tuum præsidium*—which is taken out of the Roman Pontifical in the office for consecrating an image of the Blessed Virgin, where we pray for aid, &c. from herself directly, without mentioning any intercession. Nay, they bless in her name, which was never done.

to any creature. The priesthood was ordained by God to bless in his name. No apostle or angel ever blessed the people in his own name.* But in this Primer, p. 16, you will see the priest give the blessing in these words, "The Virgin Mary, with her pious son, bless us." To which the people answer, "Amen." Here the principal part is given to the Virgin, her son only blesses with her, and she is first named. But if she be not preferred, yet she is here put upon the level with her son at least, and blesses the people jointly with him.

L. Why may not the Virgin Mary b'less as well as an angel? And we find that Jacob prayed the angel might bless his grandsons.†

G. That angel was God, and so it is expressed, "God, before whom my fathers Abraham, and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." This angel was Christ, who often appeared before he took flesh. He was the angel which wrestled with this same Jacob, and blessed him. He was the angel that appeared to Moses in the bush, and said, "I am the God of Abraham," &c. which no created angel could have said. It was he who appeared to Joshua as captain of the host of the Lord, and said as before to Moses, "Loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy,"‡ which no mere angel ever said. So that this will be no precedent for blessing the people in the name of the Virgin Mary.

* Deut. x. 8. † Gen. xlviii. 16. ‡ Jos. v. 14, 15.

Epiphanius reckons the worship of the Virgin Mary (not then so rank) among the heresies,* under the name of the Collyridians, who offered cakes to the Moon as Queen of Heaven, which is the same name they give now to the Virgin,† and she is painted standing upon the Moon her representative. Epiphanius observes that our blessed Lord foreseeing the superstition that would come into the world on account of his mother, treated her always at a distance, never once called mother, no not upon the cross, or by any other appellation than that of woman, and checking her forwardness said unto her, “woman, what have I to do with thee?”‡ She is as little named as possible in the Gospels, where Christ pronounces a greater blessing to those that hear his word,§ than to the womb that bare him: and she is not reckoned among those who saw him after his resurrection. She is but once named in the Acts of the Apostles,|| and that upon no other account than that she, with other women, continued in the communion of the Apostles after the ascension of our Lord: but none of her acts or miracles are recorded, though abundance in the legends. And she is not once named, upon any account whatsoever, in any of the Epistles. Strange that this should be so forgot, which makes now so great a part in the devotions of the church of Rome! But there is an honour of an extraordinary nature paid to her at the head of all the saints, in the office of the Mass, where, before the consecration, the

* Hæc. 78, 79.

† Jer. vii. 18. xliv. 19.

‡ Job. ii. 4.

§ Luk. xi. 28.

|| Act. i. 14.

elements are offered up to God in memory of the passion, resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ, and for the honour of the blessed Virgin Mary, &c. in *honorem beatæ Mariæ semper virginis*. Did Christ then suffer, rise, and ascend, for her honour? It was for the honour and glory of God indeed, but to thrust her in or any of the saints to share in this, looks a little too familiar, and putting them, at least her, near upon the level with the Almighty, since more could not be said to him.

And here we may see a good reason why God would not have any religious worship paid to these, or any ministers of his kingdom, nor would be worshipped with them; for he saw there would be encroaching, and coming nearer to him than was fit for the condition of creatures. They would have a share with him. Nay that they might come at last to advance these above God himself, and prefer the saints even to Christ! as it has been said, “that Christ did nothing which St. Francis did not do, yea, that he did more than Christ himself.”*

And now we see the reason why your *Index Expurgatorius* would not have it seen in the Fathers, that “God only is to be worshipped,”† for they have expunged this out of the indices of their works, that they might not be found by the people, who might take offence to see their worship divided betwixt God and creatures.

* Lib. Conform. fol. 1149.

† Adorari solius Dei est: deleatur ex Ind. Operum Athanasii Ind. Lib. Prohib. & Expurg. p. 52. Madrit. An. 1627. item ex In. Op. S. August. ibid. p. 56.

Was there ever so shameless a thing done by any church as to take upon them to correct and alter the Fathers? It is plainly to stifle the evidence against themselves: and renders every thing at least suspected that they quote out of them. And the Scriptures had been purged too, but that they are so common in the hands of Protestants, that it could not be done without manifest detection. But how far they have gone towards it, by mistranslations, adding or leaving out some words, I have shewed already. But to pursue the subject we are now upon.

Not only the souls of the Saints in Heaven, but their dead bodies or bits of them, a finger, a toe, or a tooth, or a scrap of their cloaths, a girdle, or a book, or any thing else that they used, are worshipped, and made means of grace, and great miracles said to be done by them.

L. Was not a dead man raised by touching the bones of Elisha?*

G. Yes, God may work miracles by what means he pleases. But does this consecrate the dead body of every saint to be a means of grace and a worker of miracles? Many miracles were wrought by the rod of Moses; is every rod therefore a means of grace, either ghostly or bodily? or may we consecrate any rod to be such a means? Nothing is such a means to us but what God has commanded and appointed to be done, as Baptism and the Lord's Supper. It is the institution, not an example, that makes any thing a means of grace to us. Else we might go and imitate

* ii. Kin. xiii. 21.

all the miraculous actions of Moses or of Christ, and call them means of grace to us, because so used by them.

But as to the reliques in your church, many of them have been notoriously detected, and it has been found out, that the dead bodies of malefactors have been taken for the reliques of saints, and great miracles said to be done by them. The same relique of such a saint, the head or finger is shewn in several places, and each contend that theirs is the right, and each have miracles avouched for them. Many instances of this, with vouchers undeniable, you will find in "The Devotions of the Roman Church." How then can you worship such reliques in faith? without which it is a sin!

But not only the saints, and their reliques, but their images are with you made a distinct means of grace; for in the consecration of the image of a saint, it is said, That whoever shall worship such a saint, *coram hac imagine*, "before this image," may obtain so and so, for which end the image is blessed and sanctified. So that it is not enough to worship the saint, but if I do it before such a consecrated image, I shall obtain more grace than otherwise. This makes the image itself a means of grace, for there is virtue there. Why else would it not do as well to pray, and not before such an image? Why else indeed are such images so formally consecrated, if there be no virtue in the consecration? And why do men go pilgrimages, or send vows to Loretto, or any other distant place, if they think there is no virtue in the

image there, more than in forty of the same sort which they may have at home? And the saint represented by the image is as near them in the one place as in the other; there must be then some virtue communicated to one image more than to another.

L. Then you are against any pictures or images of the saints, or paying any honour to the holy men departed.

G. No, my lord we are not so stingy; we scruple not pictures for ornament, but not for worship, or for worshipping before them, as you speak. And we honour the saints departed, as far as we think lawful, and, as we are verily persuaded, as far as they desire; since according to St. Augustine's rule before mentioned, if they accepted our adoration, it would prove them to be evil spirits. And then you are to consider, that instead of intercessors, as you hope for by your worship of them, they will vindicate themselves, and become your accusers. But in our honour of them, we first take care not to specify any particular person as a saint, but who is so recorded in holy Scripture; for we understand not canonizations by men who know not the heart; in the next place, we limit the honour we pay them by the rule of God's commandments, which we suppose most pleasing to them. We keep particular holydays for the Apostles, St. John Baptist, St. Stephen, &c. We bless God for them, commemorate their virtues, and pray that we may follow their good examples. We have one day for all the Saints in general, and another for St. Michael and all Angels. Thus we honour them, and for this we

bear the reproach of our sour dissenters, as if we were too much inclining to Popery. You think we give too little honour to the saints, and they think we give too much! But we hope we keep the mean. We abstain from the pictures or images of the saints in our churches, because they have been abused to superstition, and to avoid offence; but in places not dedicated to worship, as in private houses, we think them not unlawful, more than the picture of any good man.

Epiphanius was very zealous against having them brought into churches, and tells John, Bishop of Jerusalem, in a letter translated by St. Jerome, that finding a linen cloth hung up in a church door, (it is likely to keep out the wind) whereon was a picture of Christ, or of some saint, he tore it, and ordered a dead corpse to be buried in it. And he lamented the superstition he saw coming, by these pictures and images then beginning to creep into the church.

The abuse of things, though otherwise lawful, which are not instituted by God for standing means of grace, as Baptism and the Lord's Supper, may justly take away the use of them. Thus the Brazen Serpent was appointed by God as a means of grace for miraculous cures in the wilderness, and was preserved until the days of Hezekiah,* but when they burned incense to it, it became an idol, was broke to pieces and called by a contemptible name *Nekushtan*, that is, a bit of brass. How much more reason is there to remove the pictures and images of saints

* 2 Kin. xviii. 4.

(which God never appointed) out of our churches, when we see incense burned to them, and they worshipped in your churches, as means of grace. And yet there is no evil in the pictures themselves.

But there is one picture I think has evil in it, and is unlawful any where; and yet it is seen in your churches, and commonly over the altar, that is, the picture or image of God the Father, like an old man, &c. we are forbid to make it, and then we cannot worship it. See how positively God forbids it, “take good heed unto yourselves, for ye saw no manner of similitude (that is of God) in the day that the Lord spake unto you—lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female,” &c.* And again, “they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man,” &c.†

L. Both these texts are quoted and answered in our *Catechism ad Parochos*, upon the first commandment, and the answer is this, that the sin here forbidden is to paint or carve *imaginem Divinitatis*, “a picture or image of the Divinity,§” or of the divine nature.

G. Pray, my lord, did you ever know a painter or statuary who attempted to draw a picture or make an image of a thought, or of a soul?

L. No, for they cannot be seen. Pictures and images are made for the eye. How then can a likeness or similitude be drawn of what is invisible?

G. And is not the great God more invisible and the

* Deut. iv. 15, &c. † Rom. i. 23.

§ De Cultu & Invocatione Sanctorum. Sect. xxxiv. xxxv.

divine nature much more incomprehensible even to our thoughts or imagination? How then can it be represented to our eye? I dare say, there never was a man since Adam who would own any such thing, or ever had so foolish a thought. No, but when they drew any picture or similitude of God, it was only meant to express some of his attributes or perfections; as by fire, his purity; by a giant with many hands, his power; with many eyes, his providence, &c. And so you own that by an old man you only mean to express his antiquity. And will not this excuse the heathen as well as you? See the same excuse made by Maximus Tyrius, Dissert. 38, “Whether statues were to be made for the gods?” But here you would put an impossible meaning upon the prohibition of God, to make it of no effect, and which will excuse the heathen as much as yourselves.

L. Our *Catechism ad Parochos* (which is our text) in the place last quoted, sect. xxxiv, teaches us, that the heathen when they made images of serpents, beasts, &c. they worshipped all these as God. *Hæc enim omnia tanquam deum venerabuntur.* And that the Israelites thought the same of the Golden Calf, for that they said, “These are the gods that brought thee out of Egypt,” and therefore that they were idolaters, because they thus* “changed their glory into the similitude of a calf that eateth grass.”

G. It is very absurd to say, that the heathen thought their images to be the things of which they were the images. That was impossible, for then they would

* Psal. cvi. 20.

not be the images but the things themselves. Who ever said that a man's picture was himself? though they are called the persons, as when we look upon pictures we say, "this is such a man, or such a man:" But if any should put it upon us that we meant the persons themselves, we must think them idiots or schoolmen, that loved distinctions and wrangling. Maximus Tyrius, in the Dissertation before quoted, tells us, that they had many images of the same god, as of Venus; Diana, &c.; and yet that they did not think there was more than one Venus or one Diana. Have not you multitudes of the pictures and images of the Virgin Mary? And yet you say not that there is more than one such virgin. Now the heathen worshipped their images, and if you believe your own catechism, you must think that they took every one for God, for *hæc omnia*, they worshipped all these as God!

And it is as absurd to think that they took that serpent or beast, whose image they made, to be God. Or if they meant not any particular serpent or ox (for example) by the image, they must think every ox or serpent to be God! But they were not so ridiculous as Maximus Tyrius, and all, as many of them as have wrote, will satisfy you. But that they made use of their images only as symbols, which being dedicated to such a God, they thought that this god would afford his presence with his symbol, and by it secure to them his favour and protection. How near your consecration comes to their dedication of images, I leave to yourselves to judge. But you put such monstrous things upon the heathen as they disown, detest, and

abhor. And yet you must do it, that your case and theirs may not appear so very like.

But you must draw in the Jews too, else all this will stand you in no stead. And you have no mercy upon them, you suppose them full as ignorant as you have made the heathen. They must believe that the Golden Calf, on the same day they made it, to be the great God who made themselves and all the world, and to have brought them out of Egypt long before itself was made! But the Jews will not let this go with you more than the heathen. They were not quite so foolish. They had learned the use of images and symbols in Egypt; and it is plain they did here imitate it. They had seen Osiris worshipped in Egypt under the figure of an ox, from which they took their figure of the calf. And it was to secure God's presence among them, upon the supposed loss of Moses, by whom they had received their law from God, and directions from him upon all occasions. But Moses had been absent from them forty days, and took neither meat nor drink with him, so that they thought he had been quite gone or dead, and that they should never see him more. And then how should they do to secure the presence of God among them? And they took to this way of an image or symbol of God, not that they forsook God, but to take care that he might not forsake them. And they meant his worship in that of the Golden Calf. Therefore they proclaimed the dedication of it, "A feast unto the Lord.*" And that it was wholly for the want of Moses they did it, (by whom they had found,

* Exod. xxxii. 5.

by long experience, the presence of God secured among them) they themselves gave the reason : “ Up, (said they) make us gods which shall go before us ; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him.”*

Pray, my lord, let me ask you, suppose it were made treason to draw a picture of the king, or to bow to it ; would you venture your life upon all these distinctions and excuses which are made for the pictures of God ? Yet we venture our souls upon it, if it be a sin : and though we think it may be beneficial to us, as putting us in mind of him, or paying respect unto him.

Now by this let us learn how dangerous a thing it is to make means of grace of our own invention, and to think that by our consecrations or dedications, without warrant of God’s word, we can secure his presence with us, and procure the grace of health or any benefit either to body or soul. This is turning religion into superstition.

But the strangest instance of this that ever was in the world is that of transubstantiation, a mere school nicety which no man alive understands, and yet transformed into an article of faith by the council of Trent.

Christ said, “ this is my body,” but as to the manner or means how it was so, he said not a word ; whether only sacramentally, figuratively, or symbo-

* Ibid. ver. 1.

lically : or on the other hand, whether, substantially, consubstantially, or transubstantially. These are inventions of our own, from our poor philosophy ! and yet about these is our whole dispute ; which has tormented the Christian church in our later age more than all the other mysteries of religion. Had we kept to the words of institution as Christ left them, and gone no further, there might have been various opinions in the schools concerning the manner of the presence of Christ, in the Sacrament ; and they who had nothing else to do might have spent their idle hours, and vain distinctions about it : but it had never broke the communion of the church, if it had not been adopted into an article of faith, and made a condition of communion : and now we must dispute it. And the first thing I have to say is, that it seems very strange there should be any dispute about it. For our Saviour was then fulfilling a type of himself which was the Passover, and he kept to the same phrase or form of words which was customary with the Jews in their celebration of it, only putting himself in the room of his type, as instead of “ this is the Paschal Lamb which was slain for us in Egypt,” he said “ this is my Body which is given for you.” And when Moses sprinkled the blood, it was with this form of words, “ this is the Blood of the Testament which God hath enjoined unto you.”* Instead of which *Old Testament*, Christ said, “ this is my Blood of the New Testament.”† In which words

* Heb. ix. 20.

† Matth. xxvi. 28.

there is no difficulty at all, for no mortal ever understood these words of Moses in a transubstantial sense, and why should they the same words when Christ spoke them, following the very form of the words of Moses? This made it familiar and easy to the apostles, who called many things hard sayings which were not so difficult as this, and yet expressed no wonder or astonishment at these words of Christ, which had been impossible for them not to have done, if they had taken them in the sense of transubstantiation, for it was a new thing never before heard or thought of in the world! to deny all their senses at once!

L. I wonder you should stand so much upon this, you object your senses and your reason; and yet you must give them both up in the mystery of the Trinity, Incarnation, &c.

G. No, my lord, I must give neither of them up, for I cannot believe any revelation but by my reason; upon the evidence that appears for it: and my reason tells me that there must be many things in the infinite nature which I cannot comprehend, and therefore I acquiesce in the revelation, being once fully satisfied of it. This I have discoursed already. But for the other point, that of contradicting my outward senses, I think it an invincible objection.

L. Why? must you not give them up too, as to the Trinity and Incarnation?

G. Not at all, my lord, they contradict none of my senses. Pray tell me, which of them do they

contradict? Is it the sense of seeing, hearing, or smelling?

L. They are not objects of sense.

G. Therefore they contradict them not. But in transubstantiation they are every one contradicted. And I stand upon it, that since the creation of the world God never did or said any thing which contradicted the sense of any man. It would be destroying the certainty of every thing. Miracles are appeals to our senses, and without believing our senses, we can trust to no miracle, and consequently to no revelation.

L. I mean not a general disbelief of our senses in everything, but if a revelation (you are satisfied is true) should bid you disbelieve your senses, in such a particular only—

G. It is a needless supposition, for there is no such revelation. But if there were, if an angel should appear to me, and bid me believe that I saw him, but not to believe anything else that I saw of a hundred things I saw round about him; I should without more ado either believe that I saw the other things I did see, or if I must not believe I saw them, I should not believe I saw Him. And I take it as a certain rule, that we must either believe our senses in everything or in nothing. Had not the apostles at the Lord's Supper as much reason to doubt whether it was Christ they saw, and that he spoke to them, as that it was bread which they saw and eat? If you come once to *deceptio visus*, it will go quite through, and

you cannot be sure of one thing more than of another; because the fault is in the eye, not in the objects. So that if transubstantiation be true, there is nothing else in the world true but it!

And it is no small prejudice to this miracle of miracles, and contradiction to itself and to all other miracles, and to everything else in the world, that it should be put upon us just for——nothing——but to stagger our faith, and make us doubt of everything!

For if all the benefits of the death of Christ be conveyed to us in this sacrament, by a figurative and symbolical representation of his body and blood, and that it be so instituted for this end; it is to all intents and purposes as beneficial to us, as if we had eat the flesh of Christ off his bones, or drank the very blood that came out of his side; which is abhorrent to think, and to avoid which you call this an unbloody sacrifice. But how is it unbloody, if it be real blood, even the self same blood that was shed upon the cross? Yet you yourselves allow, that this must be taken in a spiritual not a carnal sense, because Christ himself said, speaking of this sacrament (as you own) and to solve that hard saying at which many were offended, of giving them his flesh to eat, he made it easy to them by this explanation, “it is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life.”* May we not then take his words in a spiritual sense?

* John vi. 63.

L. But you would have the words of institution taken figuratively, as when Christ said, "I am a vine, I am a door," &c.

G. There is not one man in your communion but must own that the words of institution are figurative, for example, "this cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you,"* Here is first the cup for the wine, by a metonymie, called *continens pro contento*. Then the cup being the New Testament I suppose you will allow is another figure. And it is another, to say "which is shed," for "which shall be shed," for his blood was not then shed. This last figure you have boldly avoided in your mass, where it is put *effundetur*, "shall be shed," instead of *effunditur*, or *effusum*, according to the Greek *εχχυνόμενον*. However the two former figures stand unalterable.

But to shew that the words were figurative, and that the elements did not lose their nature by the consecration, they are called by their own names after the consecration, as the wine is called the "fruit of the vine,"† after the consecration. And it is called bread which they eat in the sacrament. And we are called bread because we partake of that bread. We are bread by the same figure that bread is flesh.

L. We believe that there is no bread in the sacrament, but we are sure we are not bread.

G. You are no more sure of the one, than of the other. But see now the arbitrariness of your interpretation, when it is said of bread, "this is flesh,"

* Luk. xxii. 20.

† Matth. xxvi. 29 Mark xiv. 25. 1 Cor. 17, xi. 26, 27, 28.

that is so very plain it must be taken literally : but when it is said of the bread in the sacrament, “ this is bread,” the expression is so obscure, that it must be taken figuratively ! Is not this destroying the meaning of all expressions, to take words figuratively, or literally, just as you think fit, and contrary to the common usage, as understood in all other things ?

L. No, it is not as we think fit, but as the antient church and fathers did understand it. Here we stick.

G. And to this we appeal. Tertullian says, that Christ made the bread his body, by saying, “ this is my body,”* that is, the figure of my body.

Origen says of it, that it goes into the belly like other meat, and so into the draught ; but says he speaks concerning the typical and symbolical body of Christ in the sacrament.†

It was said of the body of Christ, that it “ should not see corruption.”‡ But we know the sacrament will corrupt, therefore it is not the same.

Theodoret likewise calls it the symbols of the body and blood of Christ.§ And says, that || upon their consecration they are changed indeed, and made other things, but still remain in their own proper nature,

* Hoc est corpus meum, id est, figura corporis mei. *Contr. Marcion. l. iv. c. xl.*

† Hæc quidem de typico symbolicoque corpore.—*In Matth. c. xv.*

‡ Psal. xvi. 10. Act. ii. 27, 31.

§ Τα σύμβολα τῆς σώματος τῆς Δεσποικῆς καὶ τῆς αἵματος.—*Dial. 2.*

|| Μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας φύσεως, ἑσίας καὶ τῆς σχήματος, τῷ εἶδός, καὶ ὁρατὴ ἐστὶν, καὶ ἀπλὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. *Ibid.*

and substance, and shape, and form, and are visible and tangible, as they were before.

And writing against the Eutychians, who said that the human nature of Christ was absorpt or swallowed up in his divinity, so that there remained now none but the divine nature in him, and that he was no more a man, and used this comparison, that is was in like manner as in the sacrament, where the bread was changed into the body of Christ; "Yes," said Theodoret, "it is in the same manner, that is, in no manner at all;* for that the bread though changed in its use and significancy, yet lost not its nature, but remained truly and properly bread as before. But had he believed transubstantiation, this had been a full and absolute confirmation of the Eutychian heresy, instead of a confutation; for then there had remained no more of the human nature in Christ, than you believe the substance of the bread to remain in the sacrament. This explains the meaning of Theodoret, even beyond his words, and he says in the same place, "That our blessed Saviour, who called himself the living bread and wine, hath also honoured the visible signs with the title and appellation of his body and blood, not changing their nature, but adding to nature, grace."

Pope Gelasius says, "That the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, which we take, is a divine thing, by which we are made partakers of the divine nature. And yet it ceases not to be the substance and nature of bread and wine: and certainly," says he,

* See his dialogue called *The Immoveable*.

“ the image and similitude of the body and blood, is celebrated in the mysteries.”*

And Facundus says the same, “ Not,” says he, “ that the bread is properly his body, or the cup his blood ; but that they contain the mystery of his body and blood.”†

And St. Augustine says, “ if sacraments did not bear some similitude to the things of which they are the sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all : but from this similitude, they often take the name of the things themselves.—As,” says he, “ the sacrament of faith, which is baptism, is called faith.”‡

And St. Chrysostom speaking of the vessels in which the sacrament was put, “ in which,” says he, “ there is not the true body of Christ, but the mystery of his body is contained in them.”§

But, my lord, not to trouble you with more quotations, I refer you to Bishop Cosin’s “ History of Transubstantiation,” where beginning at the institution, he sets down in every century, the words of the fathers upon this point. A little book, long printed both in English and Latin, not yet answered (that I

* Et tamen non desinit esse substantia vel natura panis et vini : Et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur.—*Gelas. contr. Nestorium et Eutychetem.*

† Non quod propriè corpus ejus sit panis, et poculum sanguis ; sed quod mysterium corporis ejus, sanguinisq, contineant.—*Lib. ix. c. v.*

‡ Si sacramenta, &c.—*Ep. xxiii. And. contr. Faust. Manich. l. x. c. ii.* Sic sacramentum fidei quod baptismus intelligitur, fides est.

§ In quibus non est verum Corpus Christi, sed Mysterium Corporis ejus continetur.—See St. Chrysost. opere imperf. in Matth , and Epist. ad Cæsarium, in Biblioth. P. Colon. 1618.

hear), and I believe unanswerable, wherein you will see a cloud of witnesses, through the first ages of the church, and so downwards, in perfect contradiction to this new article of your faith.

And as the scriptures, primitive church and fathers are all against you, so have you nothing in the world on your side, but an unintelligible jargon of metaphysics, upon which the schoolmen ring changes, till the noise of their bells have deafened common sense and reason. Such are their subtilties upon substance, accidents, subsistence, modusses, and modalities, and many more such quiddities; and their distinctions of *materialiter* and *formaliter*, *per se* & *per accidens*, and a thousand more, to solve all difficulties, and reconcile contradictions! no absurdity can be named out of the reach of a distinction. And when we understand it not, it operates most effectually, because then we may suppose there is something in it! Pray, my lord, let me ask you, do you know the difference betwixt substance and accident?

L. Substance is that which *sub stat*, stands under or supports another thing, so the substance stands by itself, and the accidents do adhere or stick in it. Therefore we say, that *essentia accidentis est inhærentia*, that inherence or in-sticking is the essence or very being of an accident, so that there cannot be an accident without it, for whatever sticks must have something to stick in.

G. When the substance then is gone, what becomes of the accidents?

L. They are no more, for their essence is gone,

which is inherence, and they cannot inheré or stick in nothing:

G. Now to apply this, when the substance of the bread and wine in the Sacrament is gone, as you suppose, then their accidents are no more, for there cannot be accidents of nothing, nothing has no accidents. And they cannot be the accidents of bread when there is no bread.* And you will not endure they should be called the accidents of the body and blood of Christ; therefore they are the accidents of nothing, that is, they are accidents and no accidents: they are accidents without the essence of accidents, which is inherence; there is roundness and nothing round, whiteness and nothing white, a taste and nothing tasted, liquidness and nothing liquid, &c. And if these accidents stand by themselves, why are they not substances? For that is the definition you give of substance. If you say they stand by miracle, then by miracle they are substances. And there is an end of the jargon! But who sees not that roundness without any thing round, and the like which you call accidents, are nothing at all in nature, but abstracted notions of our own heads, creatures of our making, which, like *ens rationis*, have no existence but in our brains. Yet we dispute about these, as if they were real things, which we come at last to fancy, by their being dinned so long in our ears at the schools: and we fight for them, as *pro aris & focis*, we make them articles of our faith, and excommunicate for them!

L. Notwithstanding your ridiculing philosophy,

* Catechis. ad Paroch. de Eucharist. Sacram. Sect. xxx. xlii.

you will not say, that we can see the substance of any thing. But that whatever comes under our outward senses, that is, whatever can be seen, felt, heard, smelled, or tasted, are only the accidents of things.

G. And the same philosophy will tell me that neither can accidents be seen, felt, &c. For example, a round or a white thing is a substance, but the roundness or the whiteness are the accidents; now I cannot see or feel roundness or whiteness, they are only conceptions in my mind, and come not under any of my outward senses, they are too thin to bear either my sight, smell, touch, or taste. Nay, I will say that they are beyond my imagination too, for who can think of roundness or whiteness, without something that is round or white? Therefore if I see or feel any thing, it is the substance I see or feel, that is some thing which is round or white. What colour, taste or smell, has in-sticking or inherence? For that is accident. Is it more like bread than a tulip? Thus easily may we dispute ourselves not only out of our senses, but out of our thoughts too: and the miracle of accidents without substance, must not only work upon our senses, but give us new thoughts, new conceptions, which never before came into the head of mortal man! This is that philosophy and vain deceit or fallacy which the Apostle says will spoil or hurt our faith. “Doting about questions and strifes of words—perverse disputings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: which some professing, have erred concerning the faith.” *

* Cor. ii. 8. 1 Tim. vi. 4, 5, 20, 21.

But if you are in earnest about this logic of substance and accident, will you lay a good wager upon it?

L. Hudibras says, "fools for arguments lay wagers."

G. Yet you have laid all your honour and estate upon it. But are you so sure of it that you would take your oath upon it?

L. These are foolish questions, and were never asked in any school dispute.

G. Nor ought to be, if you had let them stay there. But when you will bring them out of your schools into your creed, and make them articles of faith, you do as good as take your oath upon the truth and certainty of them; and you guard them with anathemas. And it is impossible you can believe transubstantiation, or know any thing of it, unless you be perfectly skilled in the nature and difference of substance and accident, and how far their powers do reach. You must distinguish between substantiation, consubstantiation, and transubstantiation, and determine whether the nature of accidents will best agree with *sub*, *con*, or *trans*.

L. I trouble not my head with any of these things, but I believe as the church believes, and there is an end of it.

G. Can you believe as the church believes, without knowing what she believes? This is believing nothing; it is implicit indeed! At this rate you need but one article of your creed, to believe the holy catholic church. And all the rest may go off implicitly.

though you should know nothing of any other of the articles. And what a man knows nothing of, he can give no reason for. But St. Peter bids us “be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason of the hope (or faith) that is in us.”* Which supposes our understanding it ourselves, and not an implicit faith in others, of we know not what.

So that if you make transubstantiation an article of your faith, you are obliged to understand it aright.

But there is something yet more terrible behind, for if there be no transubstantiation, then you worship bread and wine with *latria*, by which you mean the supreme worship due to God alone.

Nay, though transubstantiation were granted, and fully understood, yet it is impossible for any man to know whether he worships plain bread and wine, or the body and blood of Christ? Because in the rubric of the Mass, *de defectibus circa missam*, there are several cases put wherein the consecration is void, and there is no sacrament made, and then there is nothing there but plain bread and wine. One of these cases is, if there be a greater mixture of any other grain than of wheat in the wafer; another is, if the wine be made of sour grapes, or grapes not ripe, *si vinum fit ex uvis acerbis, vel non maturis*, which is pretty hard to know for the people, who never taste it; or the worshippers, who see or taste neither, but only a *pixis* or a cup, they look not into: and in both these cases (besides others) it is said, “*non conficitur sacramentum*, there is no sacrament made.” And so

* 1 Pet. iii. 15.

it is said if the intention of the priest be wanting, which is impossible to know : upon which head they put a pleasant case, as suppose a priest intends to consecrate ten wafers (for example) and after consecration there be found eleven or more, then none of them are consecrated, because the intention going only to ten, it cannot be known which these ten are. But if there be nine or fewer, they are all consecrated, because the intention going to ten, it includes all within that number. Besides you must take it wholly upon trust, whether there be any consecration at all ; because your priests do not consecrate before the people when they administer the sacrament, but at set times they consecrate numbers of wafers together, which they reserve for occasions, and for daily worship. Again it is said in some cases, “ *dubium est an conficiatur sacramentum*, that it is doubtful whether the sacrament is made or not.” And what shall we do in this case ? Is it a doubt whether we worship God or a creature ? Or is it indifferent to which we give *latria* ?

L. If there should be a mistake in any of these matters, and we worship mere creatures, not knowing it, for which we have been charged with idolatry, we have an answer ready, That this could amount to no more than material idolatry, but it could not be formally so, while our intention was right, and we meant our worship to God.

G. These school-distinctions are cobwebs, and will bear no weight, for material idolatry is idolatry, else it were not material idolatry. And if our intention

will solve it, it will solve it also as to the Heathen, who directed their worship and referred it ultimately to the true God, as has been shewn. But I hope you will not make Solomon so stupid as you have made the heathen, and to think that he believed * Ashteroth the goddess of the Zidonians, and Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites and the other gods of the nations whom he worshipped, to be every one of them the one only Supreme God ! Yet he is charged with idolatry, whether material or formal is not the question, nor is there a word of it in the Scriptures, for idolatry is idolatry, let it be of what sort it will. And these distinctions are only to excuse it, and let it loose among us. God has forbidden it generally, of every kind and sort. The Arians were charged with idolatry for worshipping Christ, supposing him but a creature: and they were so far from disowning the true God, that it was his honour they pretended in denying divinity to Christ. So of the Socinians, and other Unitarians among us, who give themselves that name for their supporting the unity of the Godhead. Yet they are charged with idolatry for worshipping Christ as an inferior god. And they have the same distinction as you of *latría* and *dulia*, a higher and lower degree of worship. But all religious worship is forbidden to any but to God alone. These degrees of it are of human invention, to excuse our breach of the commands of God. But we are to keep far from the forbidden thing, not try how near we can come to it, by distinctions of our own coining. We ought to

* 1. Kin. xi. 5.

“ make a hedge about the law,” as the phrase of the Jews was, to guard against any approaches towards the breach of it. Or, in the apostle’s words, to “ abstain from all appearance of evil.”* And remember that we venture our souls upon these distinctions. Which then are in the safest way ; we, who follow the direct rule of God’s commandments as they are plainly laid down to us in Holy Scripture, without “ turning to the right hand or to the left, without either adding to them, or diminishing from them,”† as we are commanded : or you, who distinguish the plainest precepts, and make them speak metaphysics ?

By which the worship of the Devil may be justified, for it is plain that when he offered to our Saviour all the kingdoms of the world, he meant not that he was the Supreme God and Sovereign Disposer of them, but only as having received this power from the Sovereign Disposer, for he said, “ that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will, I give it.”‡ And it is as plain by the answer our Saviour gave him, “ thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve,” that all sort of religious worship was forbidden to be given to any but to God only. And St. Augustine makes all to be Devils who require or accept it : *latría* and *dulia* signify both the same thing, that is service, and here all religious service is reserved to God only. The distinction of the schools is vain, and meant only to elude the commands of God, and introduce all superstition.

There are other unworthy cases put in the rubric

* 1 Thess. v. 12.

† Deut. iv. 2. v. 32.

‡ Luk. ix. 6. 8.

of the Mass, which flow from hence, as if a dog or a mouse should eat the sacrament — If the priest should vomit it up again, in which case, he is to lick it up reverently, unless it be nauseous, (that was well put in) and then it is to be disposed of so and so. And again, if a fly should drop into the cup, how the fly was to be dealt with — And one reason given for taking the cup from the laity was, that the laity (at that time I suppose) wore long beards, and lest the blood of Christ should drop upon them, or stick to their whiskers! All these are the genuine effects of superstition, occasioned by the notion of transubstantiation.

And here, my lord, let me observe, that the natural effect of superstition is atheism or deism. As one extreme runs into another, like East to West. For men of sense must find out the deceit that is in superstition, and then placing all religion on the same foot (as in your communion upon the authority of your church) they must think the whole to be a deceit, or in the modish word, priestcraft, and the contrivance of those who gain by it. Whence it is, that the Holy Scriptures and the legends have the same foundation in the church of Rome, that is, her authority; therefore the common people believe them both alike, and the men of sense believe neither. And this does so lead towards the general defection foretold, that in a great measure it is it; for it destroys the foundation of religion, and turns it all to superstition. And when the infidelity which that begets shall come to be *publicly* owned, then where shall faith be found upon

the earth? It is now acted in the *opus operatum*. And instead of the two Sacraments which Christ has appointed as a means of grace, the whole face of your religion is covered with ten thousand of your own invention. The unlimited power taken in your church of consecrating every thing into a means of Grace, your worship of saints (many of them legendary) their reliques and images, of crosses, and of the host, make up the bulk of your religion and devotions.

But not only the host, or body of Christ, supposed to be corporally in the sacrament, but the cross of Christ, or any effigies of that cross; and the images of Christ are worshipped in your church with the supreme divine adoration of *latria*; as is told us by a great saint of your church, whom you call the angelical doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas, who says that *crux Christi est adoranda adoratione latriæ*.* And again, *crucis effigies in aliqua alia materia — latria adoranda est*. And in the Roman Pontifical it is ordered, that in the procession of the Emperor and a Legate of the Pope, the Legate's cross shall be carried on the right hand of the Emperor's sword, because *latria* † is due to the cross.

And in the adoration of the cross upon Good-Friday (which is the principal part of the office for that day) the cross being veiled is discovered to the people by degrees, first one arm of the cross, then another, and at last the whole cross is unveiled: and at each time

* Par. 3 qu. 2. art. 4. in Cor. conclusio.

† Quia debetur ei (cruci) latria.

the priest says, *ecce lignum crucis*, “ behold the wood of the cross :” and the people answer, *adoremus*, “ let us worship :” and then the priest first, and afterwards the people, come upon their knees and pay their adoration to the cross. And remember that it is the adoration of *latria* which they give to it.

Now for images, the same Aquinas before mentioned tells us the worship we pay them is * *religionis cultus*, a “ religious worship,” and that it is not a different *latria* which is given to Christ and to his images, but says, “ that when worship is paid to the images of Christ, the reason of the *latria* is not different, nor the virtue of religion.” †

If then there be but one *latria*, and the same that is paid to Christ and to his images, it will justify what James Naclantus, Bishop of Clugium, writes in his Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, chap. i, ‡ “ That the faithful ought not only to worship before an image (as some perhaps out of caution speak) but to worship the image itself, without any scruple at all ; and with the same sort of worship as the prototype or whom it represents : and if that is to be worshipped with *latria*, so its image with *latria*, if with *dulia*, or

* 2da 2dæ. Quæ 81. Art. 3. Resp. ad. 3.

† Quod imaginibus Christi exhibetur cultus, non diversificatur ratio latriæ, nec virtus religionis.

‡ Ergo non solum fatendum est, fideles in ecclesia adorare coram imagine (ut nonnulli ad cautelam forte loquuntur) sed et adorare imaginem, sine quo volueris scrupulo, quin et eo illam venerate cultu, quo et prototypum ejus ; propter quod si illud habet adorari latria, et illa latria, si dulia, vel hyperdulia, et illa pariter ejusmodi cultu adoranda est. — *Venetis.*

hyperdulia, so the image is to be worshipped with the same worship."

G. I have before told of several injuries done to our Lord Christ, in adding to his commandments, and making to ourselves means of grace which he has not instituted. What I am to speak of now is an error on the other hand, that is of subtracting from his institutions, and the means of grace which he has appointed. I mean in taking away the cup from the laity in the Holy Sacrament, Christ instituted the sacrament of his Body and Blood as an effectual means of grace, calling it the "communion of his Body and Blood." Particularly of the cup it is said,* "the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ?" And that we all partake of the cup, according to several manuscripts of your own Vulgar Latin, *omnes de uno pane, et de uno calice participamus*. But that the laity might not think themselves deprived of this so beneficial a means of the greatest grace, the schools have invented a distinction they call concomitancy, which is, that in all flesh there is some blood goes along, or is concomitant with it, so that whoever eat the flesh partake also of the blood.

L. And is not that true?

G. Really, my lord, I know not. But I am sure it is a nicety. For flesh may be so dried that no blood shall appear in it, and in a wafer there can be none, without having recourse to miracle. I think it is making too bold, to throw off the institution of

* 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.

Christ, upon such imaginations of our own ; which imply that there was no need of the institution of the cup, for if it be not necessary now, it was not so then. But, my lord, this sacrament was ordained, not only to express the death of Christ, but also the manner of it, that is, by the shedding of his blood, according to the bloody types of him under the law, as it is said, “without shedding of blood, there is no remission. It was therefore necessary,”* says the apostle. But whatever blood may be concomitant in the flesh, yet here is no shedding of it expressed in the wafer.

L. But the cup always goes along with the bread in our church, to complete the sacrifice, though the priest only who officiates partakes of the cup.

G. But when the *hostia* is carried in procession, as upon Corpus Christi Day, or frequently to the sick, there is no cup, nor does the priest himself communicate. But, however, if the people are to partake of the sacrifice, as it was under the law, here they are defrauded of half of it ! And they are as much commanded to partake of the cup as of the bread. And the church may as well take away the bread, and leave only the cup, and say, that the flesh is contained in the blood, as well as the blood in the flesh. Strange power of church ! What institution of God can stand at this rate ? Suppose the Jews had neglected to pour out or sprinkle the blood of their sacrifices as commanded, and said it was sufficient that it was by concomitancy in the flesh, would this distinc-

* Heb. ix. 22.

tion have served in that case? And why not as well as in this?

It is observable that Christ, as foreseeing this taking away of the cup from many, added the word all to the drinking of the cup, * “drink ye all of it.” And it is said, “they all drank of it;” it is not said so of the bread.

L. There were none there but the apostles. So, that this refers not to the laity.

G. So you may say of the bread, and take that too from the laity by the same rule, and you take the cup from the priests who do not officiate. But Christ said to the people, to the laity, † “Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” And this is understood by all you of the church of Rome as spoken of the sacrament.

L. ‡ Bellarmin says, that the *and* there, *and drink*, is to be understood as an *or*, that is, except ye either eat or drink.

G. That is to say, I may understand all the *ands* in the creed to be *ors*, and instead of I believe this, *and* this, *and* this, I may say, I believe this, *or* this, *or* this, so that if I believe any one article, it is sufficient, though I believe never another. If you send your servant to market, and bid him bring beef, and mutton, and pork, and he buys only beef, and says, he understood all your *ands* for *ors*; and so if you bid him bring so much meat and so much drink, and he brings only the meat, for the same reason;—thus

* Matth. xxvi. 27. Mark, xiv. 23. † Joh. vi. 53.

‡ De Sacram. Eucharist. l. 4. c. 25.

we may easily get over all the commands of God, and give the reverse to St. James,* that “he who offends in one point is guilty of all.” No, but “he who keeps one point, keeps the whole law.” This is bantering instead of arguing. And it shews a cause to be very destitute, when so great a man as Bellarmin could content himself with giving such an answer.

And the doctrine of concomitancy will not do here, for if I eat a piece of flesh, suppose some blood may be said to be concomitant there; yet I cannot be said to drink, where there is not one drop. And the threatening is, except ye drink, there is no life in you.

† “If it be but a man’s testament,” saith St. Paul, “yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto.” This holy sacrament was the last testament which Christ left to his church, instituted the evening before he entered upon his sacred passion. Therefore Pope Gelasius had good reason to call it sacrilege ‡ in any who should mutilate this sacrament, and commanded that they who would not drink of the cup, should be denied the bread too.

L. This was only to discover the Manichians, who would not drink of the cup, for other reasons than the church of Rome had to take it from the laity.

G. I never heard a tolerable reason for it except because they were laity! But the dispute is not about the reasons for it, but the thing itself. To take away the cup is to mutilate the sacrament: and that is sacrilege by Gelasius’s determination.

* Jam. ii. 10. † Gal. iii. 15. ‡ Apud Gratian can. *Comperimus de Consecr.* Dist. 2.

And this last testament of our Lord, which was confirmed by the practice of the church for fourteen hundred years was mutilated by the* Council of Constans, and the cup taken from the laity, with a *non-obstante* as well to the institution of Christ, as the practice of the primitive church? It was declared no sacrilege; and the priest was excommunicated who should communicate the laity under both kinds.

The Council of Trent† likewise puts in its caveat to the institution in both kinds, and that notwithstanding the laity must be excluded from the cup. And they make it a heresy to say, that whole Christ is not under each species. Then the flesh is as much in the blood, as the blood in the flesh. And it is all one which species we take. But since the body and blood of Christ were separated at his death, and he ordained them to be so separated in the sacrament of it, I see not how we can take away either part, upon the account of their not being separated.

L. Our *Catechism ad Parochos*, gives six reasons for taking away the cup,‡ first, the danger of spilling it. Secondly, of its turning sour. Thirdly, and fourthly, for our health, because some could not bear the

* *Licet Christus—administraverit sub utraque specie panis et vini—tamen hoc non obstante—et similiter quod licit in primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi Sacramentum recipiretur a fidelibus sub utraque specie; tamen —precipimus sub pœna excommunicationis quod nullus Presbyter communicet populum sub utraque specie panis et vini.—Sess. 13.*

† Sess. 21. Can. 1, 2, 3.

‡ *De Eucharist Sacrament, Sect. lxx.*

taste or smell of wine, without being sick. Fifthly, that wine was very dear in some places, and the sixth, that we might believe whole Christ to be under each species. Gerson's reason about the long beards of the laity, before mentioned, comes under the first of these heads concerning spilling.

G. Now, my lord, I leave it to yourself, whether these reasons be not very childish, or are of weight to main the institution of Christ?

There must no comparison be made betwixt the body and blood of Christ, as to preference, or which is most valuable: but our redemption is oftner attributed in Holy Scripture to his blood than to his body. "We are saved by his *blood*—propitiation through his *blood*—by the sprinkling of his *blood*"—&c.

L. There is mention made sometimes of the breaking of bread, when there is nothing said of the cup; and this we make use of as an argument that the cup is not necessary. This is mainly insisted upon in our catechism, the chapter you just now named, sect. lxix; and Joh. vi. 51. is quoted, "I am the living bread—if any man eat of this bread—and the bread I will give is my flesh."

G. We take not this to be spoke of the sacrament, but of faith in Christ, here expressed by eating, that is, spiritually, as himself explains it, ver. 63, "it is the spirit that quickneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." But let it be taken of the sacrament, as you do, you will find the blood joined with the *flesh*, in the next words, ver. 53, "except ye eat the

flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood"—as before quoted: and again, ver. 54, "whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood"—and ver. 55, "for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." And ver. 56, "he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood"—is not the blood here named with the flesh? But if it were not, there are a hundred places, as I now observed, where the blood of Christ is named as cleansing, as redeeming us, &c. without any mention of his flesh or body. Are they therefore excluded? This is such a sort of reasoning, as if I invite you to eat with me, you must have no drink to your dinner, because it was not named. But if by eating we commonly mean the whole meal, and drinking is likewise included, this criticism upon the Lord's Supper, of calling it eating, will appear what it is, and not to be thought sufficient to exclude the cup in the sacrament. And other foundation you have none in scripture. But if I once call it eating the Lord's Supper, and several times call it both eating and drinking, will not the latter explain the former? Or will eating exclude drinking, though drinking be expressly named? To eat the Lord's Supper is the only phrase we use; I never heard any body call it drinking the Lord's Supper: and you may thence prove that we have not the cup in our sacrament, as well as that the apostles had it not, because it is said they eat bread, or broke bread. But I have over-laboured this point, because you lay so much stress upon it.

I will now shew you another restriction your church has made upon the institutions of God. As she has

taken the cup from the laity, so has she taken another of your sacraments, that is marriage from the clergy. I pass by the politic views and advantages the court of Rome has in this, as giving the Pope the more absolute command and making him in effect heir of all the great possessions of the clergy, for the canon law obliges the regular bishops not to dispose of their estates by* will, and the other clergy not to be too liberal of their alms in their sickness. And what they leave, the Pope disposes of as grand treasurer of the church. But waving all this, I will insist now only upon what relates to conscience. You reckon it a defilement in your church for a clergyman to marry. No great compliment to the married state, which yet was instituted of God in paradise while man was in his innocence. And the Apostle says,† “ marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled.” and “ forbidding to marry ” is reckoned one of the‡ “ doctrines of Devils.” And directions are given how a bishop should govern his wife and children,§ “ for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God? Yet your interpreters would have this wife and this house to be the church! St. Peter was a married man, and forsook not his wife after he was an apostle, but || “ led her about ” with him “ as other Apostles ” did; and that in the primitive church the clergy did marry is plain from Socrates his Eccles. Hist. lib. i. cap. 11. and l. v. c. 22. The vow of single life was not imposed upon

* Decretal. Gregor. lib. 3. de Testam. tit. 26. cap. 7. 9.

† Heb. xiii. 4. ‡ 1. Tim. iv. 3. § Chap. iii. 5. || 1. Cor. ix. 5.

the clergy till Pope Hildebrand. See Matth. Westmon. ad an. 1074. Vincent. Spec. Hist. l. 24. c. 45. Antonin. l. 16. c. i. ss. 21. And it was “ without precedent (says Sigebert, Chron. ad. an. 1074.), and, as many thought, out of an indiscreet zeal, contrary to the opinion of the holy fathers.” But Hildebrand was not obeyed in this in England for above a hundred years after, for our ancient records say,* “ all those decrees availed nothing, for the priests by the king’s consent still had their wives as formerly.” And Gregory the Great said † “ that it was lawful for such of the clergy as could not contain, to marry ; ” and Pius the Second said the same, ‡ “ that they may be allowed to marry.” And your great canonist Panormittan says, § “ there is as great reason to allow priests to marry now, as ever there was to restrain it.” Let St. Bernard bear witness in his time what reason there was for allowing it, he says, || “ there are many who cannot be hid for their multitude, nor do seek to be concealed through their impudence, who, being restrained from the nuptial remedies, run into all filthiness.” And another says, ¶ “ that few in those days were free from fornication.” And Matthew Paris tells that the Pope thought it almost a miracle that a

* Histor. Petroburg. An. 1127. ap. Spelm. T. 2. p. 36.

† Respons. ad Interrog. Secund. Aug. Cantuar.

‡ Pius II. in Gest. Concil. Basil. See also Platin. in his life, p. 329.

§ De Clericis conjug. can. cum olim.

|| De Convers. ad Cleric. cap. 29.

¶ Gloss. ad Gratian. Dist. 82. c. 5.

candidate for a bishopric was said to be a pure virgin. Whence the Gloss. ad Gratian in the place just before quoted, calls * fornication but a venial sin. And it is tolerated if not allowed, † however it was a less sin in a priest than marriage. For this reason, deadly sin is added to fornication in our litany. But why was celibacy enjoined to the priests? and why marriage a greater sin than fornication? Because the first is a breach of the command of the church, and the latter of the command of God! And the difference of the punishment of these in your church, shews that she thinks so; for a priest committing fornication comes off for a small penance, whereas if he marries he is degraded. May we not then say to the church of Rome, as Christ to the church of the Jews, in a parallel case, ‡ “full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition.”

But if marriage be such a defilement as is unworthy a priest, how came you to make a sacrament of it? I suppose you cannot mean less by a sacrament than a means of grace; you have made many less things so, as is shewed before. And would you deprive the clergy of any means of grace? Or is it your modesty to put them upon the level with the laity for depriving them of the cup in the sacrament of Christ's own institution?

Marriage is honourable and undefiled in all, says the apostle. “No,” say you, “it is neither in a

* Decret. P. Alex. l. 3. tit. 2. c. 3. Gloss. ad Gratian. dist. 82. c. 5.

† Ibid. dist. 34, Can. 7. Costerus Enchirid. de Cœlibat. c. 17.

‡ Mark. vii. 9.

priest." He says, "if men cannot contain, let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn.*" No, say you, it is better to burn than to marry. And this you must say, unless you suppose that all the many thousands of your clergy, and many of them young men, are every one of them endowed with the gift of continency. Which would be a miracle, if experience did not contradict it.

All sober Christians, and even the Heathen, look upon marriage as a preserver, and not a breach of chastity.† St. Peter calls it a chaste conversation. If it were not so, we may presume that Christ would not have honoured it with his own presence, and with his first miracle, nor made it so frequently as he does, the type and representation of heaven, and of his union with the church, calling himself the bridegroom and her his spouse.

The apostle says, "to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband.‡" No, say you, we except all the clergy, the friars and the nuns, whom we have put under vows to the contrary. And we will find other means for them to obtain the grace of continency! Yes, and the world is full of the effects of those means! And know whether they are better than those of God's appointment!

It is strange that you who have so many means of grace of your own, should not let those very few which Christ has made stand as he left them!

But you extend yours further than he did his, for

* 1 Cor. vii. 9.

† 1 Pet. iii. 2.

‡ 1 Cor. vii. 2.

he appointed none to be used for those in the other world: but you have offices to deliver souls out of purgatory.

L. That seems a charitable office.

G. But it is a very dark one. We have not a word in Scripture of any such state of the dead, where souls are put under pains equal to those of hell, except for the duration.

L. No unclean thing can enter into heaven.

G. Is not the blood of Christ sufficient to cleanse us "from all unrighteousness?" *

L. Yes, surely. But though God pardons the guilt of sin, yet his justice will punish in some degree.

G. Then the guilt is not fully forgiven.

L. Not so, but that we may be punished for it, as when afflictions, diseases, &c. are sent to us here upon earth. God said to David, "I have put away thy sin, but the child shall die." †

G. And the reason is given in the next words, "because by this deed thou has given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme," as if God did countenance such wickedness; therefore David was punished so as his enemies might perceive it. God punishes here either to vindicate his own honour before men: or for a trial of our faith, as in the case of Job, and to set forth such, as examples to others: or for a proof and confirmation of our religion, as in the case of the prophets and apostles, confessors and martyrs: or to correct and recal obstinate sinners, many have

* 1 Joh. 1, 9.

† 2 Sam. xii. 13.,

been reformed by this means: but all these reasons respect this life only. For you say not that souls are made better in purgatory, for you suppose them to die in the love of God, and to be in his favour, before they go thither. And why then are they punished, since they are not purified by it?

L. To satisfy the vindicative justice of God.

G. That is satisfied before they are forgiven and received into the favour of God. Unless you mean by vindicative such a spite and revenge as is seen among the most ignoble part of mankind, to say, "I will forgive, but I will at the same time be revenged for what is past." Which indeed is not forgiveness, but a plain unwillingness to forgive. But a generous forgiveness, upon a sincere repentance, loves, and embraces, and rejoices to comfort, and heap favours, like the father of the returning prodigal. God says, he will not "remember" our sins, that they shall not be "mentioned unto us, in the day when we turn from our wickedness."* And how is that consistent with enduring the pains of hell for a hundred, perhaps a thousand years, for ought we know? And how do we know what souls go to purgatory? How long they remain there? And which of them are released? Can prayers then for the releasement of such and such be made in faith? Otherwise they are sin, by the apostle's determination.

L. But the intention is pious.

G. So it is in all superstition, very pious, and that is it which deceives. But God has required that our zeal

* Isai. xliii. 25. Jer. xxxi. 34. Ezek. xviii. 22. xxxiii. 12, 16.

to him should be * “according to knowledge.” And that we † “intrude not into things we have not seen.” We have not seen any revelation for purgatory, or the state of souls there.

L. But we have the tradition of the church for it.

G. There are good and bad traditions. And they are much oftener taken in the bad sense throughout the New Testament ‡ “ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition—holding the tradition of the elders—laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men—ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition”—§ “vain deceit, after the tradition of men.—Your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers,” &c.

Yet there is a tradition which (for the evidence of it) we are willing to admit, that is, according to the rule of Vincentius Lirinensis, *quod semper ubique, et ab omnibus*, “that which was always received, every where, and by all.” And we are willing to join issue with you upon this tradition as to purgatory. This is universal tradition. And you would not desire we should be concluded by any particular tradition of this or that church or place, for you know there are many deceits in such.

But Veron in his Rule of Faith (a book much applauded in France, and put into English for the use of the Roman Catholics here) sets out in the beginning with a definition of the Rule of Faith, of which he

* *Rom.* x. 2. † *Col.* ii. 18. ‡ *Math.* xv. 6. *Mar.* vii. 3. 8. 9.

§ *Col.* ii. 8. 1. *Pet.* i. 18.

makes the first requisite to be for any article of faith, that it be clearly revealed in Scripture (and by no pretended revelation since to any whatsoever) in express words, or thence to be deduced by necessary consequence. Which when made appear as to purgatory (or any other of the doctrines in dispute) we shall readily allow it. And till then, we cannot be arraigned of heresy for not professing to believe it.

This “intruding into things we have not seen,” proceeds, as the apostle observe^s, from a * fleshly mind, measuring spiritual things by carnal. We see it takes time to purge the flesh of diseases and defilements it has contracted, and it takes a great deal of filing and scrubbing to cleanse iron that has been long rusted. Hence we conjecture the same as to souls departed, that they must be purged by fire. But the work of God upon the soul, when he grants true faith and repentance operates far otherwise; it effects the cure of all at once, as with those who looked upon the Brazen Serpent. Our Saviour himself † makes the comparison. And he ‡ gave us an example of it in the thief upon the cross, who was translated to Paradise the same day he died. And yet he had been a grievous sinner, and suffered justly for his offences; his repentance was late, and he had made no restitution; yet he did no penance in purgatory.

L. That was an extraordinary case, his faith must be very strong to be converted upon the cross.

G. That is more than we know, whether he might not have been converted before. But however, it

* Col. ii. 18.

† John, iii. 14, 15.

‡ Luke, xxiii. 43.

hews there is no necessity for purgatory, even for very great offenders.

L. No doubt God may excuse whom he pleases.

G. How then do we know whom he excuses, and whom not? And how can we pray in faith, that is, without sin, to deliver such a particular person from thence?

But if there be no necessity for it, as you have granted in the case of the thief, how is it to be imagined that God should keep so many thousand souls, for many years or ages, in the most extreme torments, when there was no necessity for it? And if the Pope has power to release out of purgatory, he must be a very cruel father who keeps one soul there an hour longer.

L. We see the church imposing penance and yet excusing some, shortening the time more than to others.

G. The church knows not the heart, and must judge by signs, which yet secure not from hypocrisy. But this is all foreign as to God, who searcheth the heart, and knoweth all that is in man. And though our physic of discipline works by degrees, and the issue is uncertain; yet God never cures imperfectly, Christ never half-healed any man. And so it is when he pardons sinners,* “Thy sins are forgiven thee.” It is not said, shall be forgiven, or when thou hast performed such and such penance, but the forgiveness of his sins was as immediately wrought as the cure of his body. And God gives us all the assurances that

* Luk. vi. 20.

can be, in the strongest expressions, of our sins being absolutely and totally forgiven, as being* “all blotted out, all cast into the depths of the sea.” Never to be “remembered or mentioned unto us” any more, as before quoted. “I will heal† their backsliding, I will love them freely.” “He is ready to forgive. He waiteth to have mercy. He earnestly remembereth, his bowels are troubled” for sinners that they may repent, and “in the day they turn from their wickedness, he forgiveth. For he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men.” It is for their repentance and reformation, but that consideration is not in purgatory.

But how will the poor souls there (if any are there) be deluded, if the stock of supererogation should fail them, that is, the merits of saints for their good works which they have done, over and above their duty, and what they were obliged to for their own salvation, and therefore are applied to others who had come short of their duty, to supply their deficiencies; which is the fund provided for the discharge of the prisoners in purgatory? And this is dispensed by the Pope to whom he thinks fit, as being the grand treasurer of the church, and consequently of these superabundant merits of the saints. But we want a text where St. Peter was constituted such a treasurer. Or that there is or can be any such treasury. For can a creature merit at the hands of God, for ever so great

* Psal. li. 9. Isai. xliv. 22. Col. li. 14. Mic. vii. 19.

† Hos. xiv. 4. Psal. lxxxvi. 5. Isai. xxx. 18. Jer. xxxi. 20. Ezek. xxxiii. 12. Lam. iii. 33.

endowments bestowed upon him? Is it a merit to receive great gifts? And if we employ them to the best advantage, is it more than is our duty to do? And we are still * “unprofitable servants,” as Christ himself has told us. But was there ever a man (Christ only excepted) who did all his duty? Are not all sinners? And if their repentance entitle them to pardon, yet this is far from merit. My doing my duty to-day, makes no amends for my having neglected it yesterday. We find the greatest saints applying to the mercy of God, and not pleading their own merits. Jacob said, † “I am not worthy of the least of all thy mercies,” and Job who had ‡ “none like him in the earth, a perfect and upright man,” &c. said, “I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes.” And Daniel, the man § “greatly beloved,” confessed his own sins, as well as the sins of the people. And St. Paul called himself the || “chief of sinners not worthy to be an apostle,” &c. And if the saints own no merit in themselves, then surely they will disown all those who apply to their merits; and, as I said before, concerning the worship and invocation of them, by which you hope to gain them to be intercessors for you, they must become your accusers, by their denial of their acceptance of such worship from you, which if they should accept, it would make them evil spirits, as I have quoted out of St. Augustine.

But what creature dare plead purity before God? ¶ “Behold he chargeth his angels with folly, and he

* Luke, xvii. 10. † Gen. xxxii. 10. ‡ Job. i. 8. xlii. 6. § Dan. ix. 20, 23. || 1 Tim. i, 15. 1 Cor. xv. 9. ¶ Job, iv. 18, xv. 15.

putteth no trust in his saints ; yea, the Heavens are not clean in his sight. How much more abominable and filthy is man, who drinketh iniquity like water ? And what is man that he should be clean ? And he that is born of a woman, that he should be righteous ? And if “ all our righteousness are as filthy rags.” * If there be † iniquity in our holy things, in the holy sanctuary and altar, what then is clean ? ‡ And if the righteous themselves shall scarcely be saved, what merits have they to spare for others ? Especially when they are not saved even by their own works. § “ For by grace ye are saved — not of works, lest any man should boast.” Can any man then boast of his works, as not only sufficient for his own salvation, but over and above as meritorious to be applied to others, and to deliver souls out of purgatory ? No, my lord, the saints make no such boasts ; and will disown all those who make them in their name. For they know that || “ all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God ; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ — where is boasting then ? It is excluded. By what law ? of works ? Nay, but by the law of faith.” And every man is saved by his own faith, not by the faith of others. And God will ¶ “ reward every man according to his works,” not the works of others. Miserable then is the condition of those souls supposed to be in purgatory, if they must not thence be deliver-

* Isaiah, xliv. 6. † Exod. xxviii. 38. Lev. xvi. 33. ‡ 1 Peter, iv. 18. § Eph. ii. 8, 9. || Rom. iii. 23, 24, 27. ¶ Matth. xvi. 27.

ed but by works of supererogation, when no man can be saved by his own works, for “ we are saved * not according to our works, but according to the grace of God in Christ Jesus. † “ Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us — through Jesus Christ our Saviour.” We have no other Saviour, nor can be saved by the merits of any other. None other can merit from God. The greatest saint that ever was is saved only by mercy, and the forgiveness of his sins. Let us therefore not trust to the supererogated works of those, which were not able to save themselves. ‡ “ That every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” § “ for in his sight shall no man living be justified. There is none righteous, no not one.”

But besides all this, there are degrees of glory in heaven. So that if any could supererogate, yet has he nothing to spare to others, because he has received the full of his reward himself. This shuts up purgatory for ever, by exhausting every penny of that treasury reserved for redemption from thence.

And the expectation of having those many sins called venial with you remitted after death, does naturally make men more careless in their life. And trusting to the merits of others, will abate their diligence in being nicely righteous themselves.

L. But we find some instances among the fathers of prayers for the dead.

* 2 Tim. i. 9. † Tit. ii. 5, 6. ‡ Rom. iii. 19. § Psal. cxiv. 2.

G. Some few among the fathers you may, but none in Scripture. But what were these prayers? They were for peace and rest to those who were supposed to be in peace, yet might receive increase of happiness even before the resurrection, as some suppose heaven itself to consist in an eternal increase of bliss. But without this, we may pray for continuance of peace to those who are in peace, though we know it will surely be; as when we pray “thy kingdom come, thy will be done,” we know it must be, but this shews our assent and wishes for it. And in this sense we also pray for the dead, that it would please God, * “shortly to accomplish the number of his elect and to hasten his kingdom, that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of his holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in-body and soul, in his eternal and everlasting glory.” And we bless him, † “for all his servants departed this life, in his faith and fear; beseeching him to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that, with them, we may be partakers of his heavenly kingdom.” So that we pray for them as well as for ourselves, that we with them, may be partakers, &c. But neither these prayers of ours nor those of the ancients, have any relation to purgatory or delivering souls from thence, as from a place of torment.

Some of the ancients had an imagination of a purging fire through which sinners were to pass, but

* Order for the Burial of the Dead.

† Communion Office. Prayer for the church militant.

they meant the general conflagration at the last day. Which comes not at all to your notion of purgatory. But I would not trouble your lordship with excursions, or debating every branch of these disputes, only give you a summary view of the heart of the cause, and to see where the matter pinches. And indeed, my lord, my endeavour with your lordship is rather to state the case, than to argue upon it; for truth needs no more than to be fairly shewn, it convinces of itself; and best when it is naked, without the fucus of philosophy and distinctions which are endless.

These will put a colour upon *implicit* itself, and make you believe you understand what you know nothing of! My lord, give me leave to say, your whole religion is implicit, not only as to the particular points we have discoursed, but your whole public worship is such, while your prayers are in a language not understood by the people. How then can they * “pray with the understanding,” as the apostle requires? And “how can they say amen, seeing they understand not what is said?”

L. They have prayers of their own, and carry little prayer books with them which they read while the priest is repeating the public offices.

G. But this is not joining with the priest, and they cannot say amen to his prayers. What then have they to do at church? This is not communion. It is purely implicit, and nothing else but *opus operatum*.

* 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 16.

It is an invention without precedent, for it never entered into the head of man or church since the creation except only the church of Rome. And of which the apostle gives this character, * “will they not say ye are mad?”

What is it short of this which Suarez says, † “that it is not necessary to prayer that the person praying should think of what he speaks.” This is *opus operatum* with a witness! and a parrot may be taught thus to pray. And how do they pray with the priest, who are talking of business, or chatting of news while he is offering up their prayers to God, in a language of which they understand not one word, and therefore cannot give attention to it? And these are the greatest number, *viz.* of the common people who cannot read, and so cannot carry private books of devotion with them; though if they did, it would not be joining with the priest, nor could these be called common prayer, which are offered up with one accord, pursuant to St. Chrysostom’s prayer, with which our daily public prayers do conclude.

And now, my lord, upon the whole, if the advantage does not seem to your lordship to lie on our side, in all the particulars before-mentioned; yet can you have any doubt of the safety of your soul in our way? Since all our danger is, omitting some things that might be profitable, but cannot be called necessary: whereas if the error lies on your side, you are involved in manifold superstitions, and of adding to and subtracting from the word of God.

* Ibid. ver. 23. † De Orat. lib. 3. c. 14. and Salmeron, &c.

L. I confess nothing sticks with me but the church, of being in the church, and preserving the unity of the church.

G. Therefore I began with that, and desire to close with it, for it is the *jugulum causæ*.

I have shewed wherein the unity of the church did consist, according to the institution of Christ, and as the primitive fathers understood it, that is, an unity in faith, and in the mutual love and good correspondence of Christians and sister churches; though one sister must be elder than another, and Rome was not the eldest: one might be greater or more powerful than another, and this did vary, according to the course of this world: Jerusalem was at first the only church of Christ, then Antioch became the greatest of the gentile church, where Christianity first received its name, afterwards Rome became the greatest, from being the seat of the Roman empire, but Constantinople was the first assumed an universal supremacy, when she became the head of that empire. And this was it which broke the unity of the sister churches, and filled them with schisms and divisions among themselves, one affecting superiority over another, and increasing it to an absolute temporal dominion. Of which Christ said to the apostles, * “It shall not be so among you.” And again, (for they contended more than once for the superiority) after the institution and celebration of the holy eucharist, just as he was going to enter upon his sacred passion, and to take his final leave of them, this dispute arose again, “which of

* Matth. xx. 25.

them should be the greatest?" and that was the time to determine it if ever, but he again checked their ambition, and the error of their thought, as if the church were to be governed with temporal sway and authority, like the grandeur of secular princes, but told them plainly * "ye shall not be so."

And in his farewell sermon, continued upon the same occasion, and at the same time, he insisted much upon their unity, and placed it, not upon the superiority of any one of them over the others, but in their mutual love and good agreement with each other, in their union with God and with himself, upon which he wonderfully expatiates in most exalted words, which take up four whole chapters in St. John, and begins, † "little children, yet a little while I am with you — A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another——By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." This is the unity of which Christ speaks in these his last words to the apostles. He said, ‡ "my kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight."——But he that calls himself *servus servorum*, the servant of his servants, has fought, and raised bloody wars in defence, as he says, of this his master's kingdom! And he will have the government of it just the same as of other kingdoms of the world, and its unity to consist, like theirs, in being under one absolute and despotic head or king. But no kingdom of the earth will content him. He will be universal

* Luke, xxii. 26. † John, xiii. 33. ‡ John, xviii. 36.

monarch of the whole world. And why? Because Christ is the head of all churches, and therefore must have an universal vicar. And from the same parity of reason, because * “ God is the king of all the earth,” therefore he must have an universal vicar in temporals. And if England, France, Spain, &c. should contend which of them were this universal vicar, would not the answer be easy? That the contest was foolish and vain, for though one kingdom might be greater or more ancient than another, yet was it still but a part of the whole, that is of the world. And that God had appointed no such universal vicar. The case is exactly parallel, unless it can be shewed, that Christ has appointed such an universal vicar in the church; and told us plainly who it is, that we may obey him. Which when done, we will own ourselves heretics, schismatics, and what you will, till we return and pay our obedience to him.

But on the other hand, if Christ has appointed no such universal vicar, then are you under a mortal mistake concerning the unity of the church, which you place wholly upon our being united in obedience to such an one. And your church is the great breaker of ecclesiastical unity, while she will bear no sister church, but will be the mother of all churches, though she be not the eldest.

This, my lord, is the very heart of the cause. And we are verily persuaded that there is not the least ground for this universal supremacy, either in the Holy Scriptures, or in antiquity, or in the reason of

* Psal. xlvii. 7.

the thing, or in fact, since the first foundation of Christianity to this day, or that it was ever acknowledged, or is now, by the majority of Christian churches. And yet this is the foundation of all the disputes betwixt your church and ours, and all other Christian churches.

Christ foresaw the consequences of trusting an universal supremacy in the hands of fallible men. An universal king must ruin the world, for appeals to him must lie in all causes from all the parts of the earth, and men must attend with their witnesses, and all other things necessary to carry on a lawsuit. The oppression of this (beyond all other tyrannies) may appear by the appeals to Rome, in the times of popery, no further than from England thither, where causes lasted from age to age, loudly complained of in those times, and attempts made to restrain it in some measure by several of our acts of parliament, but not to purpose till the Reformation : and this indeed made the Reformation even necessary, for the preservation of the people, as well laity as clergy, who groaned under this burden, which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear. Dr. Parker, late Lord Bishop of Oxford, in his excellent Discourse sent to the late King James, when he was Archdeacon of Canterbury, printed here in the year 1690, says upon this head, p. 29, “ I myself enjoy a small office in this church, wherein my predecessors had a suit for a privilege belonging to it, hanging in the court of Rome for some hundreds of years, till the very time of the dissolution of the Pope’s power.” Hence we

may judge how it would be with the churches, in the Indies and the most remote places in the world, if it were all under his power, as he pretends ! But the good Providence of God has not suffered it to extend to half of the Christian churches (as before is said), and his wisdom and goodness has still preserved the major part true protestants against this usurpation ; besides the great number he has rescued from it, and has never suffered any of these reformed churches or nations to return to it again, as before has been observed : and besides that the principle itself, and the pretensions of the Pope to this universal and unlimited supremacy are beat down and exploded by the Gallican church, and others the most learned who still remain in his communion whether he will or not, and though he excommunicates them afresh every year !

And now, my lord, I cannot but think it made plain to a demonstration, that this universal supremacy is a thing impracticable ; and that if it could be in fact, it would be the greatest ruin and oppression to the church that is possible. And if an universal king would be insupportable to the world, how much more an universal bishop to the church ? For he must have an absolute dominion over our faith, over the holy Scriptures, and over the church, which must suddenly fall (as I before quoted Gregory the Great) if it comes to depend upon one. And that whoever should assume it, would be as he prophesied a Lucifer, and the forerunner of Antichrist. And can he be less, if he has usurped so vast an authority, and

infallibility itself to support it. I said before, that an universal king would make all wars to be rebellion, and so incurable but by utter destruction. Thus it is with the universal bishop, opposing his supremacy is heresy, schism, and excommunication: and is the only article in your Creed to be believed explicitly, as for the others, *implicit* will do for them all! That is, it is no matter whether you believe them or not, so the sovereignty of the universal bishop be maintained inviolably!

But though every king is not a bishop, yet the universal bishop must likewise be universal king, with power to depose all kings at his pleasure. Of this I have spoke at large.

And though nothing need be said to this almighty claim, both in spirituals and temporals, but to put you to the proof of its institution by Christ, who disowned all civil power himself, and said, * “who made me a judge?” Yet I have gone further, (that this cause might be put out of all dispute) and shewed the inconsistency of your own claim to be the only Catholic Church, and to enjoy the true unity of it, in these particulars following.

1. There never was a church called Catholic, in the sense of Rome, that is, which was owned by all other churches as their head, at least since that of Jerusalem.

L. But we admit none other to be Christian churches but those who do own it.

G. That is to say, it must do one way or other, if

* Luk. xii. 14.

the mountain will not come to Mahomet, Mahomet must go to the mountain. It is like the bed Procrustes made to fit all persons, by stretching those to the length of it who were shorter, and cutting off part of those who were longer than it. Thus the church of Rome becomes universal, by stretching her communion to those who stand excommunicated by her, and cutting off all churches who will not own her supremacy. And thus she must be still universal, though she had no more left than the diocese of Rome; or suppose none but the Pope himself, then he would be the universal church! And it may well be preserved in a Pope, if it may in one laic, a woman or an infant.

2. And then there will be perfect unity. And I am afraid not till then; for perfect unity is not only in outward communion, that is, being within the same walls together: or in subscribing a formula of articles of faith, half of which must be believed implicitly: but an unity likewise in saving or damning principles and practices, in love and charity, for which chiefly we shall be* judged the last day. If these are wanting, the unity will be very imperfect, and stand us in little stead.

3. There ought to be also an unity where to place your infallibility (else it is none) of which I have given four schemes, each one contradictory to all the rest, and not yet determined by your church. And this is an unity in faith among you. It is the foundation upon which your church is built.

4. There must be an unity and full agreement which

* Matth. xxv. 31. &c. † Joh. xiii. 35.

of the articles of your creed are to be believed explicitly, and which implicitly, that is indeed which are necessary to be believed, and which not? Without this, your faith is wholly uncertain.

And till these things be adjusted, you cannot be said to have unity even in faith.

And if you have not unity in faith; nor in those principles and practices which are no less necessary to salvation; nor in that love and charity which Christ has made the characteristic of Christians, and without which* no man can know who are his disciples: but instead of that, if you have envyings and strife among you, among your several religious orders, betwixt national and national church, concerning the infallibility and supremacy of the Pope, and of his power to depose princes, upon which the peace and unity of the world, and our eternal salvation does depend; and in short, if you have no unity concerning your rule of faith itself, or of your practice, what will the unity of outward communion do, upon which you lay the whole stress? It will not so much as denominate you Christians, far less to be the only Christians in the world, or the Catholic Church.

It is true that unity in communion is a desirable thing, and ought to be preserved among all Churches; but it is still a part only of the unity of the Church, as I have shewed. And that the supremacy of the Pope has been the chief cause of the breach of it. But yet it is not such a breach as destroys all other parts of the unity of the Church, their unity in one

* Joh. xiii. 35.

Lord, one faith, one baptism. It may be called an essential part of the perfect unity of the Church, but, alas! what is perfect upon earth? And it is not so essential as that the want of it should quite un-church; so that if there were not a church upon earth that did communicate with another, yet they would not all cease, for that cause only, to be Christian churches. As if all the nations in the world were at war with each other, yet it would be the same world still, and God's one kingdom upon earth, and each nation a part of it.

L. But the unity of the Church ought to be more than that of the temporal world.

G. True. But we say, *magis et minus non variant speciem*, that more or less alter not the kind, as a greater or less quantity of gold (for example) alters not the species of the gold. So unity is unity, be it more or less. And there is an unity among all nations, even though at war, the unity of blood, and of reason, being all made of one blood, and all endowed with the same reason, which makes them all agree in some common principles, and all appeal to reason in the justice of their wars. But this unity is not perfect while they bite and devour one another.

And though the unity is greater, where revelation is added to reason, and men agree in the same religion which we call the Church; yet this unity is not perfect, while there are disputes, animosities, and various opinions about it. And in the Church of Rome herself there are great variety of opinions among those of her communion, and animosities thereupon raised, so

great as gives her much trouble to compose, and sometimes finds it past her power, and is forced to bear what she cannot remedy.

L. What do you mean then by the holy Catholic Church in the Creed?

G. This article was but late put into the creed, on occasion of divisions which arose among the churches, to mind them that they were all members of the same body, of the one Catholic church. The next article explains this, and may be called a part of it, *viz.* the Communion of Saints, and these are only the elect, who are not visible upon earth; and therefore must be referred to heaven, where only is the true Communion of Saints, without mixture of the reprobate, who are not members of Christ, and but in appearance, of the church. We have no unity of the spirit with these, and consequently are not one body with them: * for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? And what unity hath that church where these are mixed together? Therefore the archetypal and truly Catholic church in heaven, is that which is chiefly and principally meant by the Holy Catholic Church, and the Communion of Saints in the Creed. And there only, is perfect unity.

There is the great body of the church; there are but few at a time upon earth, and of them we know not which belong to that truly Catholic church or not. And who do not, cannot be truly Catholics, though

* ii. Cor. vi. 14.

they bear that name with us. And of them so called, you yourselves will not say that there is perfect unity among them, in all the necessary and most essential parts of it before mentioned.

But if that article in the Creed had been meant in your sense, it must have been the Holy Roman Catholic church, and not left us to seek where to find this church, the infallible guide. And you yourselves have not found it, while you are in quite contrary opinions where to find it. But by leaving it in the general and indefinitely under the name of the catholic church only, it is rather exclusive of any particular church, and extends to all Christian churches, which make up the Catholic church upon earth, in such an unity as our fallen state will bear, where human passions are not subdued, but mix themselves in our religious as well as temporal concerns. Therefore by the unity of the church you cannot mean a perfect unity; no not even with your head, and in doctrines which are indispensable towards your eternal salvation, as in the deposing doctrine, upon which the apostle has pronounced damnation; and which, if not true, Cardinal Perron, as before quoted, gives up the church of Rome, for many ages past, for the very synagogue of Antichrist. See also the morals of the Jesuits, which though condemned by some, are defended by others. This is not perfect unity, even in necessities; and the *Bulla in Cœna* breaks it to pieces, where whole churches and nations are excommunicated of those you say are in the unity of the church,

and in his communion who has excommunicated them !

But if we will be content with no unity in the church but what is perfect in all things, the consequence must be, that we have no unity at all. As our pretence to infallibility is the greatest instance of our fallibility. And if we will have no guide but who is infallible, we must have none upon earth. And so the church is rendered wholly useless to us, if we may not take their help, as instructors and rational guides, or in the apostle's words, as "Helpers of our joy, without giving them the dominion over our faith."*

And indeed the security you demand of an outward infallible guide, is altering the course of nature, or as I called it, finding fault with the creation ; for God has made us rational creatures, and given us no other guide but our own reason, with the assistance of his grace, to come at the knowledge of himself, and consequently of all other things. And to find fault with this, is the clay saying to the potter, " Why hast thou made me thus ? " To bid us divest ourselves wholly of our reason, or to believe implicitly, which is the same thing ; and is not in our power, whatever we may think, because reason is our nature ; and that we should not believe our outward senses, is indeed to make us other creatures than God has made us. And to refuse the assistance of a church, because she is not infallible, is depriving ourselves of a means which God has appointed ; and is the same perverse.

* 2 Cor. 1. 24.

ness, as if we should refuse to consult a lawyer or physician, because it is possible they may err in their judgment. But though I allow their skill to be better than mine, in their several professions, yet we still keep to ourselves so much use of our reason, that if I knew it was poison the physician were going to give me, I would not take it : and there are some things so plain, that no lawyer could persuade me to. Much more ought we to be careful in our eternal concerns, and not to give ourselves up implicitly to any whatsoever, that if they should direct us against the most express commands in Scripture, or the dictates of reason and common morality, or bid us deny all our senses, we must acquiesce without examining ! This is abandoning both sense and reason which God gave us as a guide, and therefore will require it of us ; and this only is that which will render us self-condemned, and bear witness against us at the last day : for as I said, it is not in our power to extinguish reason in us ; though we may blindfold it and keep it down for a time, yet it will recoil upon us, and convict us, wherein we have departed from it. Without this there could not be such a thing as a sting of conscience, for what is that but a check to our reason ? What else is repentance, or returning from any error, or from any evil we have done ? You endeavour to convert men to your church wholly upon their reason, for you can have no other topic whereby to lay hold of an adversary : in vain therefore would you persuade him to trust to that choice of his reason in coming over to you, but never to trust any other choice his reason should make

afterwards, because it is very fallible; I say this could not go down with any man, but it must make him doubt whether his reason has led him right in the first choice too of going to your church, and from the same argument, because his reason is very fallible. God says to us "Come now and let us reason together."* We ask no more of you. Nay, you cannot refuse it us, whether you will or not; for your own reason will, as I said, one time or other, return upon you, and convince you of obstinacy in not hearkening to reason, for without this you cannot be said to have acted according to reason. This renders me inexcusable, whether I be right or wrong; for if my reason misleads me after due examination, the error is human, and will be more easily pardoned, but if I will not hear, I will not open my eyes, it makes me guilty though I were in the right, because that is by chance, and not my choice upon reasonable conviction, which I have refused. And truth is never afraid, for the more it is canvassed it appears the brighter. It is strange to see those who pretend to such an assurance as is infallible, and yet seek to avoid the light of reason, as if afraid of being detected! And to confess it in the very body of their canon law,† where

* Isac. 1. 18.

† *Inhibemus quoque ne cuicunque laicæ personæ liceat publice vel privatim de fide Catholica disputare. Qui vero contra fecerit, excommunicationis laqueo innodetur.*—Corp. Jer. Can. Sext. Decretal. lib. Quint. Tit. ii. cap. ii. § 1. Paris, 1687.

they excommunicate any laic, who shall publicly or privately dispute concerning the Catholic faith.

This method will secure to them all that they have caught: but if observed by others as well as by themselves, they would never catch another. And it is a plain indication that who are against reason, reason is against them.

For if reason could be heard, it would make it very obvious to you, that in all the particular points before mentioned, the certainty is on our side, and the doubt (at least) on yours. For example, none make a doubt but that we may lawfully pray to God, and not before any image of him: or without the worship or invocation of any saint joined with him; and so of all the rest. But on your part, if what I have said make them not appear unlawful to your lordship, yet they must remain at least doubtful, till some stronger evidence be produced for them than has hitherto been given. There is not a prayer in the public offices of our church to which you may not heartily say amen, in full faith and assurance: which is impossible to say as to purgatory, invocation of saints, &c. And then such prayers must be sinful. Rom. xiv. 23.

But you are pinned down in all these particular points by the authority of a supposed universal bishop, wherein likewise you place the unity of the church. And yet there never was such a bishop, or universal monarch, unless any prince calling himself so, would make him such. What is an universal monarch who was never owned by half of those he calls his subjects?

And whose authority is limited and restrained, and his excommunications despised, by those who pretend to own him, and to be subject to him? What is it to fancy one's self king of all the earth? And to place the unity of the world in such a monarch as never was in the world? And to call those rebels from him, who never were in subjection to him? This, my lord, I have shewed to be the case of the greatest part of the Christian churches, and from the beginning. And consequently this universal supremacy is merely imaginary. It was never named by Christ, nor ever was in fact. And so far is it from being the center of unity, that the pretence to it has been the great breach of unity among Christian churches, and is at this day: for this is it which stops the bishops in the communion of Rome from exercising the freedom of their own judgments, and that authority which Christ has given them over their own flocks, and will require an account of it from them; and which was freely exercised by the bishops in the primitive church; and which, if restored, would open the way to that Catholic communion so greatly desired, and wherein the true unity of the church does consist. Which never can be hoped, while a negative is given to the Pope in all the particular points disputed, and especially concerning his own supremacy. But if the bishops of his communion would think themselves at liberty and under obligation to act of themselves, as in the primitive church; and as ordained by Christ; the points we have discoursed as to doctrine and worship seem to me

so very plain, that there could be no dispute which were the safer side to take: at least that it would not be thought a sin so to purge their public offices as that those Christians might lawfully join in them: and let opinions remain as opinions, not made articles of faith, and conditions of communion. And to this nothing stands in the way of the bishops of France, at least, but the fear of that excommunication from the Pope which is renewed against them every year, and which they pretend not to regard. But they are kept under by the shadow of the phantom of an universal supremacy, which never was in being; and if it were, would be insupportable and ruin the church; and which they themselves have in effect already rejected, as inconsistent with the liberties of the Gallican or any other national church; and has bred all the dispute betwixt them and the church of Rome. And can never be healed in good earnest, if the Pope be judge of the controversy. See then the cause of the breach of Catholic unity.

And now, my lord, forgive me, for I am sensible that there is an uneasiness at first and a prejudice to hear any thing contrary to those principles in which one has been educated from his infancy, and thinks most certain. But this must be overcome so far as to hear reason, which will confirm us the more if we be in the truth, or otherwise convince us of our error, at least make it so far excusable, that we have not refused the reasonable means of information: without this, no man could have been a Christian at first, nor has

been since but by accident, according to the place where he was born, or received his education. But the prophet calls a due examination of these things * a “ shewing ourselves to be men.” And the apostle gives it the character of a nobleness of spirit in those who † “ searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.” And “ therefore (says he) many of them believed,” of the honourable both men and women. Whilst those bigotted who stuck to implicit faith in the church, it is said, ‡ “ believed not,” but were “ moved with envy,” and stirred up persecution against those who disturbed them in their security, like waking one out of his sleep, though when it is done, he will thank those who have raised him from darkness to light, to seeing with his own eyes, instead of being led by others implicitly in the dark, and lulled into dreams of security from his blindness, in which he is persuaded there is less danger of stumbling, than if his eyes were open, because every man’s sight is not good, and has deceived many! Have I not taken a horse for a man at a distance? And does not a stick look crooked in the water? Why then should I trust my eyes any more? This is all the reason ever I could hear for not trusting to our reason! and what is the remedy proposed? If it were to give us rules whereby to judge of true reason, to help it, and to trim this lamp which God has lighted for us, this would be rational, like clearing our eyes if they were

* Isai. xlvi. 8. † Act. xvii. Ibid. ver. 5.

dim : but the remedy you propose, is, to shut reason quite out, to make no more use of it, to silence, to extinguish it ; and take implicit faith in its room ; like pulling out one's eyes, because they are not good, and choose to be led by the hand, and never examine our way any more ? But I think the apostle recommends examining to us, and I will conclude with his advice,

“ Prove all things ; and hold fast that which is good.”*

* 1. Thess. v. 21.

END OF PART IV. AND VOL. II.





